

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1874.

The Week.

THE President, in selecting Mr. Waite for the Chief-Justiceship, has, with remarkable skill, avoided choosing any first-rate man. Mr. Waite stands in the front rank of second-rate lawyers. He is little known out of his own State, and would not be known at all if he had not been one of the counsel at Geneva—a position which he owed, it is said, to the recommendation of Mr. Delano. He has never, we believe, or only very recently, made an appearance in the Supreme Court, which ought to be a strange thing to say of any man appointed to the Chief-Justiceship. But he undoubtedly is a man of the highest character, and has the best possible standing at the bar of his own State, and this is saying a good deal, for the Ohio Bar is in all respects excellent; and strong testimony to his local reputation is supplied by the fact that the nomination found him acting as President of the State Constitutional Convention now sitting. The *World*, however, asks, with much point, what would be said, if General Sherman had died last year, and the President, instead of putting Sheridan or Hancock or McDowell in the vacant place, were to fill it with an obscure Western brigadier. This is a very natural observation to make, but it does Mr. Waite some injustice. He stands much nearer to the right man than an obscure brigadier does to Sheridan. On the whole, considering what the President might have done, and tried to do, we ought to be very thankful, and give Mr. Waite a cordial welcome.

A recent visit of Mr. Conkling to New York was ascribed by rumor to his desire to consult with the "managers" here as to the propriety of his changing his mind about a seat on the bench and leaving the senatorship vacant at this critical period; but it is now said that he simply came on to argue a law case. The managers would, we should think, be opposed to any political change at present, the election of last year having been succeeded by deep gloom. Tom Murphy's life has, since the failure of Henry Clews and the fall elections, been one of comparative retirement and reflection, so that his comments on political events have even more than the importance which should always attach to the utterances of a dear and trusted friend of the President. He offers an explanation of the nomination of Mr. Cushing which is, we think, adequate, viz., "that they made such a fuss over the nomination of Williams that the old man got mad." The *Tribune* supplies another version of this story, and tries to give it an air of authenticity by calling Murphy "The Hon. Tom Murphy" instead of plain "Tom," but ours is the correct one.

The feature of the week in Congress has been long debates in the Senate on the financial affairs of the country, and the transaction of a good deal of routine work in the House. In the latter body there has been one more attempt to commit the members to inflation, but it has failed again, as Mr. Kelley's exactly similar attempt failed last week. Mr. Wilson of Indiana was the gentleman who took Mr. Kelley's place in offering the inflationist resolution. It simply demands an increase in the circulating medium, on the ground that business depression has decreased the revenue; that increased taxation is very undesirable; and that more currency is the true cure for the troubles under which we labor. The West and South were largely for the resolution; the East and Northeast, exclusive of Pennsylvania, against it. We observe that, of the Democrats voting, more than two-thirds voted in favor of receiving the resolution, and less than one-third against it. It failed by 135 ayes to 98 nays—not two-thirds. As the Senate is understood to be safely conservative on the subject, this vote is regarded as reassuring. It is the subject with which the Senate has been chiefly

concerned during the week, though it has also discussed Post-office matters. Speeches on the Finance Committee resolution have been made by Messrs. Schurz, Buckingham, and Howe, who may be classed as anti-inflationists, Mr. Schurz being such very decidedly and without reserve, and by Messrs. Morton, Logan, and Wright of Iowa. Mr. Wright asked, "Why all this struggle to get back to specie payments?" and said that he had been answered, "Because it is the world's currency"; but he thought "the world would get over some of its old notions on that subject, and, in conclusion, denied that the voice of the great West was for a return to specie payments." The House on Thursday finished its Naval Appropriations Bill. An amendment to it was offered by Mr. Randall, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, providing for the punishment of officers making outlays in excess of appropriations, and an amendment to this was offered by Mr. Loughbridge, Republican, of Iowa, excepting cases of sudden emergency. Both were defeated, and the bill passed.

In the Senate, two great speeches were delivered by Senator Wright of Iowa, and Logan of Illinois. The latter was the more interesting and original of the two, Mr. Logan's views on the subject being different not merely from those of Mr. Wright, but from those of every one else in the known world. Mr. Logan says that "the word money itself has never yet been fully defined," and, as he proposes no definition himself, it is difficult to see how he got to his second proposition—though it is probably through the process known among the Washington correspondents as "deep study and thought"—that "a metallic basis is not absolutely necessary," from which he no doubt derives the third proposition that "a standard of values should be distinguished from a medium of exchange." "History and existing facts," Senator Logan added, "show that a return to specie payments is not necessary to secure stability to our currency," so that it hardly seems necessary to go into a comparison of the annual gold product of this country with the other annual productions; this, however, Mr. Logan does, giving the proportion as one to sixty-seven—which seems to us to show that we ought to have sixty-seven times as much currency as we now have, or say in round numbers \$50,000,000,000. Mr. Logan does not positively say that he is in favor of this increase, and indeed, we are glad to say, declares himself in favor of "ultimate resumption," either by means of "contraction or legislative proclamation"; but at present he thinks we ought to have exactly \$850,000,000, because he says this is a "proper supply." Mr. Wright is in favor of the three-sixty-five plan.

It is a very remarkable fact that while these inflation speeches and resolutions have been occupying the attention of Congress, what little public declaration of opinion on the subject outside there has been, has been in favor of contraction. The members of the National Board of Trade are quite as deeply interested in the currency as any one in the country, and the National Board of Trade has just passed the following resolutions by large majorities:

"Resolved, first, That the National Board of Trade respectfully recommend to Congress that there shall be no further issues of irredeemable paper money whatsoever.

"Second, That in the opinion of this Board it is the first duty of the Government to provide for the retirement and cancellation of so much of the legal-tender issue as has been taken from the so-called \$44,000,000 reserve."

This Board is not an Eastern board, either. It is made up of members from all parts of the country—Chicago and St. Louis as well as Boston and New York. Probably half the desire of Congressmen to inflate the currency comes from the old belief which led us into the first issue of greenbacks, that "the people will not stand further taxation," or, in other words, that if taxes are increased as a means of meeting the deficits of the revenue, Messrs. Kelley and Butler and their friends will not be re-elected.

The National Cheap Transportation Association has held a meeting, with these results: It denounces the building of railroads on bonds; the "inflation commonly known as the watering of stock"; the majority system of corporate representation; "rings"; and the combination of freight and passenger lines; declares that relief must come first from legislation, second, from competition; demands, first, a national law providing a Bureau of Commerce and Transportation, which shall have power to prescribe a uniform system for keeping railway accounts and such other powers of supervision and regulation as may be constitutional, and whose duty it shall be to make an annual report to Congress and suggest legislation tending to improve our present system of transportation—second, a law making it a penal offence for any public officer to accept or use the free pass of any railway company, and prohibiting railway companies from granting such passes to any but regular employees of each railway; declines to "endorse" land-grants or subsidies, but recommends that in future railroads and canals be constructed "by the National Government," "by contract to the lowest bidder," and that, when not required for Government use, "all citizens" should "have the right to place cars and locomotives thereon," and to "operate the same, subject to regulations to be provided by the Government"—one of which, we trust, will be that no citizens shall be allowed to operate their locomotives on the same track in an opposite direction, except after notice duly filed at Washington.

Meantime, the Association recommends the passage in each State of laws creating a railroad board, with power to fix rates and to "prescribe a uniform system of keeping railway accounts"; providing for minority representation; restraining the roads from paying unjust dividends, and compelling them to expend all sums in excess of just dividends in a proper manner for the benefit of the public; prohibiting companies from making any unfair discrimination between non-competing points; obliging all railroad companies to transport cars which do not belong to them as rapidly and cheaply as their own; preventing leasing, consolidation, and combination of competing lines; prohibiting railroads from holding more real estate than they actually need, and from mining, or any other business than transportation; making it a penal offence for public officials to take or the roads to grant to any but railroad employees free passes. It is also recommended that "in charters hereafter granted, the State reserve the right to regulate charges, and that no work shall be contracted for until sufficient money is in the treasury to pay for it; that the dividends shall not exceed ten per cent. upon the actual cost; and that the capital stock shall not be increased without authorization from the legislature, and when such increase is made that said stock shall be disposed of at auction to the highest bidder." The Association is also going to send a committee to Washington, to ask Congress to authorize an expenditure of some money on the water-routes.

There is a passage in the late report of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury which the daily press has passed over with little or no comment, and which nevertheless touches on what we believe to be one of the most serious questions in our politics, and one which, if not dealt with now in its small beginnings, will give a world of trouble hereafter—we mean the thoroughly communistic principles on which much of the manual labor required by cities, States, and the General Government is procured. All other kinds of labor in the public service are greatly under-paid. The judges, the clerks, the heads of departments, the officers of the army and navy and of the custom-house, except the collectors and detectives, are all poorly paid—paid very much below what similar labor brings in the general market, and any attempt to raise the standard is met by frantic opposition. If there is talk of raising the salary of the Chief-Justice of the United States to half the amount received by a lawyer of high standing in full practice at the bar, we are informed with howls of disapprobation that plenty of men can be found who will do the work for half the money. But when it comes to fixing the pay of

artisans or common laborers the tune changes. The market rate is cast aside, and an ideal standard of justice takes its place. An eight-hour law was passed for the benefit of Government laborers two years ago, on the theory that as much work could be done in eight hours as in ten. The Supervising Architect shows that this has been fully disproved by experience. Government mechanics do eight hours' work in eight hours, and no more, so that the change amounts, so far as the taxpayers are concerned, simply to a rise of 20 per cent. in wages. Moreover, on many buildings, mechanics and laborers employed by the Government directly work side by side with others employed by contractors—the former only eight hours a day, the latter ten. The effect of this on the minds of the men may be easily imagined. It produces, of course, either a sense of wrong and discontent on the part of the contractor's men, or a feeling that the Government service is a kind of charitable refuge. The Architect well says:

"If this rule is, however, to be the permanent policy of the Government, and its mechanics and laborers are to be compensated at the rate of 20 per cent. above the highest market rates, I see no reason why officers, clerks, and other employees of the Government should not be paid by the same rule. Under the present system, gentlemen of education who occupy positions of trust and great pecuniary responsibility in the different bureaus actually receive less than mechanics' wages, and are discriminated against in favor of men who, as a rule, exhibit little interest in the performance of their duties and have no responsibility whatever. It is also a fact that many mechanics receive, under the present system, not only more than their foremen and master-mechanics, but more than the superintendent of the work on which they are engaged, the latter classes being allowed no compensation for extra labor performed."

We need not call attention to the fact that all discrimination against head-work in favor of hand-work, in spite of the mystic blatherskite which is poured forth so freely on this subject, is a discrimination against civilization itself.

The postal-car quarrel between the Government and the railroads, which threatened last year to produce serious difficulty in the transmission of the mails, has been revived, but on this occasion the question at issue has been made much clearer than before. The roads complain in substance that they are paid no more now for carrying the mails than they were before the introduction of the postal-car system, while the expense of transportation is very much greater. Formerly the mails were carried, as indeed they now are except between the large centres of business, like ordinary freight or baggage, taking up little room and causing no trouble of any kind. Now, however, on the trunk-lines between large cities—as, for instance, on the Boston and New York line—the Government, for the greater despatch of business, forces the roads to run what are called postal-cars, which are in reality as expensive, or nearly so, as first-class passenger cars, and to transport in them several post-office clerks for the purpose of sorting and arranging the mails. These clerks travel free of expense, while the postal-cars themselves are frequently run at a dead loss. These facts the Government does not deny, but says that it will not pay any more to the roads because they derive certain indirect advantages from the postal-car system, but these indirect advantages are obviously not enough to explain why the Government should not pay for the actual service rendered. It would be a curiosity of law, or rather politics, if the recondit learning developed at Geneva on the subject of obtaining compensation for "indirect damages" should be reproduced by Mr. Cresswell, under the new and improved form of what might be known as the doctrine of "indirect benefits."

The English papers contain some explanation of what has hitherto seemed somewhat obscure, the overthrow of Castelar. It appears that when the Cortes met, Castelar made his report, and a vote of approval or thanks was moved, which was met by a motion for the previous question, whereupon Castelar threatened to resign; and the vote of thanks having been lost by 120 to 100, after a bitter attack on Castelar by Salmeron, we presume on account of his threat, Castelar did resign. This occurred on January 2d, and on the morning of the 3d General Pavia, the officer in command at Madrid, sent an order to Salmeron to dissolve the Cortes, which

after a fruitless attempt on the part of Salmeron to get Castelar to resume office, was executed at the point of the bayonet by Pavia in person. The first accounts represented the *coup* as perpetrated by Castelar or in his interest, but there was no foundation for this supposition. It was apparently prepared and prompted by Serrano, in the interest of Don Alphonso, and was simply a resumption of the attempt which failed on the 23d of April last, when the Permanent Committee tried to overthrow the Ministry.

Serrano was immediately appointed dictator, and will probably govern alone for an indefinite period. The hope which many persons had begun to entertain that the establishment of "the republic," if it had done nothing else, had put an end to military pronunciamientos, has thus been rudely dissipated. The failure of the operations of General Moriones against the Carlists is now acknowledged on all hands, and it is probable that he will be removed, and it is also probable that Serrano, who is not a bad soldier, and is liked by the army, and will have the aid of the troops hitherto held before Cartagena, will push the Carlists with increased vigor. It is right to add that what has occurred as the result of the quarrel between Castelar and Salmeron was foreshadowed in the European papers before the close of December. Salmeron is an honest and benevolent Sentimentalist, the bee in whose bonnet is horror of capital punishment. With killing going on in every direction, he cannot bear to have the Government kill—a state of mind which, of course, commands the admiration of brigands, assassins, and mutineers. The other Radical chief, Pi y Margall, has his bonnet full of bees, and approaches more nearly to the type of Stephen Pearl Andrews. He was the great founder of the "Federal Republic," and cannot see why the world does not go round "on principle" without law or force.

An incident has occurred in Italy which illustrates the oddity of the relations which the Government of that country maintains towards the Papacy. The inhabitants of two parishes in the province of Mantua were disgusted by the appointment of two anti-nationalist priests by the bishop, and therefore refused to receive them, and met on the public square of their villages and unanimously elected two others who are well known for their patriotism. This places the Government in an embarrassing position. In its anxiety to satisfy Catholic Europe that its taking Rome meant nothing hostile to the church, it enacted guarantees of ecclesiastical independence which now, when the danger is past, tie its hands in a very inconvenient way. The Minister, Signor Vigliani, in replying to an interpellation on the matter of the elected priests in the Chamber, while expressing his sympathy with the people was forced to confess that the Government could not confirm or give its *placet* to the elected priests so as to enable them to receive their dues, as it was bound by the law to confirm only those presented by the bishop. All it could do to help the new movement was to refuse its *placet* to the priests appointed by the bishop, as the bishop has not, as required by law, presented to the Government the Bull by which he was appointed himself. It is now generally admitted that the Government, owing to its own concessions, must get the worst of it in all similar conflicts. In the meantime the Pope is firmly persuaded that his present difficulties are one of those passing storms by which the church has been often assailed, and the conservative spirit is so strong in Italy, and the disgust excited by the "Latin" performances in France and Spain is so great, that there is little likelihood that any attempt will be made, for some time to come, to push him to the wall.

The new Prussian civil-marriage law is found to be a more sweeping measure than was at first supposed, as it extends to births and deaths as well as marriages. Under it, all marriages, baptisms, and deaths must be recorded with a civil registrar, leaving the parties to call in the aid of the church or not as they see fit. The change, as we have said, is received with great delight by the larger portion of the educated—that is, of the sceptical—class, but it is as distasteful to the Orthodox Evangelical Protestants as to the Catho-

lies; and the Berlin correspondent of the *London Times*, Dr. Abel, himself a Prussian, and a very trustworthy observer, predicts as a not unlikely result of the shock the law may give to old and deeply-rooted prejudices, especially in the country districts, a reaction in favor of religion. At all events, thus far the high Protestants are by no means favorable to the new legislation any more than the high Catholics. Archbishop Manning, who has been delivering in London an extraordinary lecture on "Caesarism and Ultramontanism," in which the Papal pretensions are put forward with the utmost baldness, says that this war against the Pope was determined on in 1866 after the war with Austria. The truth seems to be that as soon as the Pope found himself likely to be deprived of his temporal power, he tried to make friends with Prussia, and negotiations were carried on until 1870, when Bismarck was found to be too exacting, and, on his finally demanding concessions to the Old Catholics, the Pope broke with him and began hostilities.

The French Conservatives are fighting their way slowly through their string of "constitutional measures," and have just carried their plan of giving the appointment of all the mayors to the Government. The last effort of the Radicals, to effect a kind of compromise by which the appointments would have to be made from the members of the municipal councils, was lost by a majority of 14. Perhaps one of the most curious and interesting features in the situation is the effect produced on the majority by the defeats its candidates are sustaining at the polls—even in Conservative districts like Brittany. Instead of looking at them as indications of public opinion which it is their duty to bow to, as Americans or Englishmen would look at them, the majority treat them as symptoms of a deep-seated moral and political disease, which it is the duty of the Government to combat by heroic measures; and therefore, instead of submitting to the voters, they are creating machinery to deprive them of their votes or to make them vote differently. Now, the future of France would look much more hopeful if this was simply a Conservative craze, because the Radicals are sure to come to the top again before long, and then we should have a restoration of the popular sovereignty. But the melancholy truth is that the Conservatives are doing exactly what the Radicals would do were they in power and found the peasantry going for Henri V., and very much what Gambetta tried to do when he was making arrangements for the election of the present Assembly.

The Russian Government has published in the *St. Petersburg Gazette* an explanation of the reasons which led it to depart from the policy it had announced, when invading Khiva, of refraining from annexation either in whole or in part. The recent treaty, of which we lately gave the leading points, makes some important abstractions from Khivan territory as well as Khivan independence. One of the principal objects, the *Gazette* says, was to secure Russian territory and traders against incursions and robbery at the hands of the Turcoman bands, but it was plain after the war that the Khan of Khiva was too weak to carry out any guarantee he might offer on these points. Some material precaution had, therefore, to be taken by Russia herself, and the obvious one was the location of a fort at some point where the garrison could perform the triple duty of protecting the Russian frontiers from raids, the caravans from robbery, and the Khan from intimidation by the Turcoman hordes. The best point for this purpose would have been the southern shore of the Sea of Aral, but this is a vast unhealthy swamp, so there was nothing for it but to push up along the right bank of the Amoo, and, as this involved a long line of communication, prudence required the annexation of the desert between the new fort and Russian Turkestan, particularly as the river is not navigable in winter. The Khan cordially acquiesced in all this, and indeed was so doubtful about his own position in the future that he asked to have a Russian garrison left in his capital. The cession of territory on the right bank of the Amoo to Bokhara is ascribed to a desire to place the caravan routes under the protection of the Khan of that country, and make him responsible for them.

THE INDIANA ECONOMISTS ON THE PROSPERITY OF AUSTRIA.

THE way in which inflationist theories have been received in the House of Representatives renders it difficult for one to know what to say about their prospects. Judging from the votes taken the other day on Mr. Kelley's resolution and the opposing resolutions of Messrs. Holman and Hawley, the great body of the members are in a condition of complete indifference to the whole matter, and will do whatever any safe party-leader suggests as most desirable. Each of these resolutions obtained a large majority, and at the close the self-stultification which resulted from the adoption of them all was received with loud laughter. That the majority of one branch of the national legislature should be as ignorant and as deficient in self-respect as this incident indicates is, perhaps, in some of its aspects, a melancholy subject of reflection; but then it at least warrants the belief that we are in no danger of seeing a determined effort to expand the currency. The Republican majority is apparently not equal even to that. It is only capable of some lower form of folly. In the Senate, things look much more hopeful. Several of its ablest men, including Messrs. Morrill, Schurz, Sherman, and Fenton, have taken strong ground against inflation in any shape, and have made lucid expositions of its evils in recent speeches. The only member of that body who has ventured to reproduce the old fallacies about paper-money is Mr. Morton, who outdid Mr. Kelley by declaring on "information" that those nations of Europe which were now using irredeemable paper were more prosperous than any others. It so happens that two of them, Austria and Italy, have within ten years been delivered from an odious tyranny, both civil and ecclesiastical, and are now, for the first time in their history, enjoying the blessings of free government. That they should have begun to prosper under these circumstances as they have never prospered before, is nothing wonderful; and that they should have done so thus far in spite of the use of irredeemable paper is nothing wonderful either. One of the first effects of the abandonment of hard-money is always prosperity. Something is in the first place saved by the adoption of a less expensive medium of exchange, and then the expansion of the currency, by sending prices up, fills all minds with hope and stimulates all branches of industry. But then, Austrian and Italian statesmen are not so simple-minded as Mr. Morton. They know very well that such prosperity is delusive, and that the day of reckoning must surely come, and therefore, instead of clamoring for more paper, they are moving heaven and earth to cut down the quantity of it and provide for its redemption. If we take the experience of Austria, we see why it is that the financiers of that country are wiser than Morton, who apparently has not read even the financial history of his own country.

The Austrian Government first began issuing paper legal-tenders at the same time that France began to meet the expenses of the war of the French Revolution. In January, 1799, the notes stood at 103; in December they stood at 133. The discount on them, or, as we call it, the "premium on gold," thenceforward rose steadily, the Government all the while making fresh issues, until, in 1810, the paper stood at 500; that is to say, it took \$500 in paper to purchase \$100 in coin, the total amount in circulation being \$530,399,356. During this period, too, the value of the paper often varied from 20 to 30 per cent. in the course of twenty-four hours, and the discount rose on one occasion to 1,200; that is, the gold dollar was worth twelve dollars in legal tenders. This was a bad state of things, and the Emperor Francis I. got into his head a bright idea by way of remedy, but he was far from agreeing with Mr. Morton, that the more paper-money a country has, the better it is off. So he issued a decree ordering all the notes then in circulation to be brought in and exchanged for other notes of one-fifth of their face value; this at one stroke reduced Government liability by four-fifths, and left it only \$106,079,871, in what Mr. Richardson and Mr. Boutwell call the "non-interest-bearing" department. Confidence was not restored, however, and the Emperor was not satisfied, so he issued another decree, in which he deplored the burdens of the Govern-

ment, and said that he had been urged, in view of them, to repudiate a portion of the principal of the public debt. To this, however, he scorned to consent; but in order to balance the receipts and expenses and save his faithful subjects from fresh taxes, he would simply reduce the interest on the public debt one-half. He was apparently as much opposed to "bloated bondholders" as Messrs. Morton and Butler. The war continued, however, and in 1815 the Government was in greater difficulties than ever, and began manufacturing paper-money again. By 1816, it had once more \$319,357,962 legal-tenders afloat—an increase of 200 per cent. The "premium on gold" now became frightfully high, and with this evil an attempt was made to deal, Thaddeus-Stevens fashion, by decreeing that the proper relation of paper to gold should be \$2 50 for \$1, and no more.

Still, there was no rest or peace. The "down-trodden masses" did not appreciate their blessings. There was great misery and discontent, and it was agreed on all hands that there would have to be contraction somehow, and an ingenious contrivance was hit on for this purpose. A national bank was established, the shares of which were sold for paper-money at the above rate, and then the paper-money received for them was destroyed; and in addition to this, all legal-tenders received in exchange for notes of the bank were destroyed, and the bank-notes were redeemable in coin. The volume of legal-tenders was thus reduced by 1839 to \$6,715,000, and there was then, even at this point, witnessed a remarkable spectacle, which will probably astonish Indiana economists, of paper legal-tenders issued by the Government circulating at a discount side by side with bank-notes which were at par because, although not legal-tenders, they were redeemable in coin.

Things were in this condition when the Revolution of 1848 broke out. The Government then set up the printing-press and began the manufacture of paper-money once more; the national bank suspended payment, and its paper also was made a legal-tender. Gold, silver, and even copper disappeared as if by magic, and small change was made by tearing the florin (half-dollar) bills into two and four pieces, until at one time there were \$640,804,403 of this scrap money in circulation. Since the restoration of peace, vigorous efforts have been made to reform the finances as well as other things, and they have been materially aided by the great improvement in the Government and the reduction of expenses. Instead, however, of issuing more paper, as on Mr. Morton's theory of the cause of national prosperity they ought to have done, the Austrians went to work to reduce the amount already in circulation. By a decree of April 27, 1858, all that remained of the notes of 1812 and all the scrap money made since 1848 were withdrawn, and there now remain only new issues and the bank-notes to be dealt with. In this, as is plain to be seen, they have been running directly counter to the doctrines of the Indiana school of economists. A table of the course of the discount on Austrian bank paper ("premium on gold") since 1848 given by the *Economiste Français* is interesting:

March, 1848.....	100%	June, 1859.....	144
May, 1848.....	110	Jan., 1861.....	152
Aug., 1849.....	127.50	June, 1866.....	145
Nov., 1850.....	152	Dec., 1873.....	110

The circulation now amounts to \$188,441,431 in Government notes and \$169,286,225 in bank-bills, or \$357,727,656 in all—about the amount of ours before the issue of "the reserve"—for a population of 35,000,000. But there has been a total collapse in Austrian finance and industry since April of last year—the like of which has never been known in time of peace, and which the Government is as yet vainly endeavoring to cure by a system of state loans on the security of land and some kinds of goods. Instead of clinging to irredeemable paper, the leading Austrian statesmen see in it the greatest barrier to the prosperity of the empire, and are so eager to get rid of it that they have recently entertained a proposition to borrow enough coin from Prussia to enable them to resume specie payments. Their exertions have been and will continue to be greatly supported by the stimulus given to the material growth of the coun-

try by the establishment of constitutional government and the publication of the national accounts—a practice which was only begun in 1860.

THE FARMERS' FUTURE.

DURING the past nine months, no political event has occupied so much of public attention as that popularly known as the Farmers' Movement. Although the agricultural organizations called Granges have been in existence for several years in some of the Western States, and it is possible that the Farmers' Associations, which are their political equivalents, have also some age to boast, it is only within the year that has just ended that the reform agitation headed by these latter associations has appeared upon the surface as a distinct political force. In one year it has certainly accomplished astonishing results. It has completely upset the politics of some half-dozen Western States; it has carried consternation, doubt, and despair among the hearts of the politicians in many more; it has even threatened a revolution in the more conservative communities of the Eastern seaboard; and, finally, it has made its way to Washington, held meetings in the hall of the House of Representatives, secured the appointment of Congressional committees, and can probably now number (to say nothing of committee-reports and laws) more conventions, more associations, and more permanent organizations of all kinds, local, State, and national, than any political power in the country, always with the exception of what seem to be those eternal forces of nature—the Republican and Democratic parties. Nor has its effect been felt only in the political world; the progress of the farmers' movement has been felt among the industrial classes of all kinds—the professional classes, the manufacturers, the importers, and even the stock-brokers. Indirectly, it has helped to cause a great disturbance in the financial world, and through its effect on stocks and all railroad securities, not an individual in the United States, from the politician, railroad man, pork-man, mowing-machine manufacturer, to the physician, lawyer, clergyman, trustee of the widow and orphan, but has been made to feel how the uprising of a "down-trodden class" "comes home to men's business and bosoms."

Yet, notwithstanding all this, the movement has failed—failed so completely that there is now little interest in the subject. No shipper expects to ship his goods any cheaper during the coming year for it; no traveller expects to carry his wife and family to the sea-side or the mountain at any less cost for it; no one who had a hand in the passage of the Illinois pro-rata law has the slightest expectation that it can ever be enforced; no railroad man believes that it will prevent his watering his stock; no newspaper editor any longer in private conversation—what he writes is of course another matter—professes to find it a serious subject.

There is, to be sure, a National Cheap Transportation Association which declares that relief from present abuses must come first from legislation; that what we first need is a national bureau of commerce and transportation, which shall prescribe a "uniform system of keeping railway accounts"; which is radically opposed to all land-grants and subsidies, because it thinks that railroads ought to be constructed by the National Government itself, and, "when not required for Government use," that "all citizens" should "have the right to place cars and locomotives thereon" and "operate them," subject, of course, to just regulations; and declares, among other things, that freight-rates ought to be established and regulated by a Board of Railroad Commissioners in each State. No doubt we have not heard the end of the movement yet. Measures will be introduced into both Houses of Congress, and possibly some of them may be, as the pro-rata law in Illinois, passed; but we say the movement is dead, because the experience we have had of it already has proved that it produces no practical effect in the direction in which it was intended to produce practical reforms; that the indirect effects it has produced have been those of confusion and distress in a country which at

present peculiarly needs repose and recuperation of its forces; that the treasury is empty, and the movement is now in the hands of those whom no one profoundly confides in.

The farmers' movement, politically considered, has indeed passed in the last few months through the various stages of progress from birth to decay and dissolution to which all movements of the sort seem nowadays to be destined. Coming into activity from a genuine and natural disgust springing out of vaguely-understood grievances, it has grown in life and power until it has attracted the attention of crafty and designing men, who have seen an opportunity of making it a means of power or pelf for themselves; the regular machinery of popular organization—the caucus, the convention, the national association, and so on—has been adopted; the great unwieldy body has been captured and led through the mazy chain of political intrigue, to the amusement of the public and the profit of the enterprising managers. If any one had predicted a year ago that the Grange movement would end in an agitation for the building of more railroads by the Government in the interest of some of the best-known railroad men in the country, who would have believed it? And yet it has come to this indeed.

The Granges have, however, other than political aims; and as there is no reason to believe that their organizations will do anything but increase in numbers, it is interesting to consider what may be their future, and how important a part of the body social they are likely to become. The Granges were originally formed as a sort of protective organization, not merely, as is perhaps commonly supposed, for the purpose of protection against the railroads, but for general protection of what we may call the trade of agriculture in its struggle for existence with surrounding and predatory neighbors, as well the money-lenders, the machine-makers, the pork-men, the seed-men, and the guano-men as the freight-agents. The guano-men, the seed-men, and the pork-men, the manufacturers, the capitalists, stock-waterers, and freight-agents, and we may add the piano-men (who extort money from the farmers by preying upon the musical taste common among their wives and daughters), all had their organizations, designed to wring money out of the agricultural population, while the farmer himself had no means of protection or defence; he was at the mercy of his foe. Mr. Grosvenor, in the article in the *Atlantic Monthly* to which we referred at the time as reaching generally just conclusions on the subject of the Railroads and the Farms, gave an extraordinarily lurid picture, so sympathetically done that we cannot forbear quoting it in full, of the situation of the innocent farmers; and though the oppressors whose midnight conclave he depicts are apparently freight-agents, a scene quite as terrible in its hideous truth to the nature of the farmer's imagination might be drawn of annual meetings which are held for the regulation of his bank rates for money, or the price he pays for reapers, or his pork, seed, guano, and piano tariff.

"Three men meet in a room in New York. They are not called kings, wear no crowns, and bear no sceptres. They merely represent trunk-lines of railway from the Mississippi to New York. Other points settled, one says: 'As to the grain rate, shall we make it fifty from Chicago?' 'Agreed: crops are heavy, and we shall have enough to do.'

"Business finished, the three enjoy sundry bottles of good wine. The daily papers presently announce that the trunk-lines have agreed upon a new schedule of rates for freight, which is in effect a trifling increase—on grain, from forty-five to fifty cents from Chicago to New York, with rates to other points in the usual proportion. The conversation was insignificant, the increase 'trifling.' But to the farmers of the Northwest it means that the will of three men has taken over thirty millions from the cash value of their products for that year, and five hundred millions from the actual value of their farms.

"The conversation is imaginary; but the startling facts upon which it is based are terribly real, as Western farmers have learned. The few men who control the great railway lines have it in their power to strip Western agriculture of all its earnings; not, after the manner of ancient highwaymen, by high-handed defiance of society and law, the rush of swift steeds, the clash of steel, and the stern 'Stand and deliver!' The bandits of modern civilization, who enrich themselves by the plunder of others, come with chests full of charters; judges are their friends if not their tools; and they wield no weapon more alarming than the little pencil with which they calculate differences of rate apparently so insignificant that public opinion wonders why

the farmer should complain about such trifles. Yet the farmers have complained, and, complaining in vain, have got angry."

Though this description is amusing enough, we have no desire to cast any ridicule upon an organization of farmers designed to protect the interests of their class. The day is certainly gone by in which doctrinaire politicians of the "natural-rights" school can hope to persuade the American public that we are to have no Old-World "classes" in this country; that notwithstanding the divisions of men into diverse occupations and antagonistic pursuits, they will still remain identified in sympathy and saved from social disturbances by the principle of equality before the law. In the last four years, we have seen in the United States almost every large trade or profession of importance organize itself for the purpose of discussion or mutual information, and also for protection. There is through the entire country a growing conviction, first, that the interests of some trades and professions are for immediate purposes antagonistic, and that the beast of the law as at present administered, that it deals out even-handed justice among them, is without basis in fact. Throughout the more growing and prosperous parts of the country there has been for years a growing dissatisfaction with legal remedies, because they have not been administered as they should be; and when courts of justice fail, there is no resource but self-protection. For protection, organization is necessary.

For years the farmers have been in a manner oppressed. They have, it is true, neglected their own interests, and for the consequences they have only themselves to blame; but nevertheless they have been oppressed by having an unreliable and changeable judiciary, corrupt and incompetent legislatures, and good laws which were not enforced and bad laws which were enforced. They have been oppressed too by a monstrous and misshapen tariff, so complicated that its operation on the actual industry of the country is almost as mysterious and little understood as the perturbations in the earth's orbit by an undiscovered planet. They have been oppressed just as the consumer of milk has been oppressed by adulteration, just as the coal-consumer has been oppressed by the "Pennsylvania monopolists." They are not the only oppressed class, however. The guano-man and the seed-man and the pork-man are all oppressed by bad laws, by unjust decisions, and by the natural change from a simple to a highly artificial state of society.

It is this change, now going on all over the country, which makes us inclined to believe in the permanence, not directly for political but for social purposes, of the various sorts of trade and professional organizations which we see rising into importance. It is beginning to be more and more evident every year that professional, class, and trade interests are real living things, and not mere figments of the brain, which can be legislated away. Not all the writings of political economists on the unity of interest of capital and labor have been able to stop the formation of protective trades-unions. Not all they have said is now preventing attempts to form associations of the same kind in the interest of capital. Bitter experience has taught lawyers even that it is possible for the bench and the bar to become hostile to one another. The stock-brokers have assumed extra-legal functions of the most important kind, and protect themselves almost by military discipline against the banks, and the banks against them. On whatever side we look, we see an inclination in those who follow the same calling, whether it be industrial or professional, to band themselves together for the purpose of fostering the peculiar interests of their craft and defending them against interference from outside. The formation of such unions or associations is no more to be deprecated than the advance of the varied civilization which produces them. The farmers' organization has been more noticed than any of those which preceded it because it involved such an important and universal branch of industry, and, from our old associations with farming life of an earlier day, our natural sympathies were inclined to the side of the tillers of the soil. But as it has become clearer and clearer that the business of farming in the West is nothing more nor less than a branch of a speculative

trade, it has also become more and more evident that the Grange organization is merely a business union, which may or may not do good, but which is to be looked upon as merely one of a countless number of similar unions all over the country, which are gradually dividing from one another, and segregating into separate bounds, the once homogeneous, the lately confused and heterogeneous elements of American society, in accordance with the only principle of division and segregation at present possible—that of occupation.

NEW ACTIVITY AMONG CREATIVE AUTHORS.

EVEN if it had not been for some time well understood that there is an unpleasantness existing between the Creative Authors and the Critics, two or three noticeable onslaughts recently made by the Creative branch of the profession upon the junior branch would have caused the fact to be generally known. It is true, an attempt to say a fresh word on this perennial struggle is not a hopeful one; but there are quarters in which even the old utterances appear to be freshly required; and perhaps there may even still remain a new consideration or so to be brought forward to the notice of the elder and more presumptuous of the guilds. That body certainly would seem to be in need of a note of recall. So wary a veteran as Mr. Disraeli, for example, in his 'Lothair,' picks up a hatchet of the stone age, as we may say, and goes out of his way to attack the critics with an old, old slur. Lord Lytton, too, in one of his posthumous novels, written nobody knows how long after the assault in 'Paul Clifford' on the editor of the *Asinæum*, returns once more to the familiar business, and makes a portrait by no means prepossessing of the contemporary British critic of a certain order, Mr. Chillingly Mivers. This portrait, it is true, is not drawn with the sole purpose of animadverting upon the relations of the journalist to the author, the literary critic to the literary creator. The journalist attacked represents also a philosophy of human nature and a system of government against which Lord Lytton set his face. But the narrower purpose is included and is to be discerned in the larger; we are to learn that the critical order is to the creative as the supernatural order in theology is related to the natural, or with the further difference between them that the one is of good and that the other is of evil, and does evil.

Curiously enough, in the latest editions of the great critic of 'Coddingsby' and 'George De Barnwell,' the assailant of Disraeli and Bulwer, we may find reprinted an appeal by Mr. Yellowplush himself, vivid with indignation against a certain *Times* critic, and almost if not quite querulous in its exhibition of feeling. It seems, as one reads it, almost a case that demands a quotation from Mr. Yellowplush's own epistle to the "honorable barnet" who wrote 'The Sea Captain': "Don't let any such nonsense take your reason prisoner. What! you an old hand amongst us, an old soldier of our stirring queue the press, you who have had the best pay, have held the topmost rank—you to lose heart and cry picky, and begin to howl because little boys fling stones at you! Fie, man; take courage, and, baring the terrows of your blood-red hand, as the poet says, punish us if we have offended you; punish us like a man, or bear your own punishment like a man."

It must be confessed, however, in behalf of the honorable baronet, and of his critic as well, that this bearing punishment like a man, or feeling, as regards the critic, the proper spirit of contempt for his understanding the moment he disagrees with you, and thus disarming him forthwith, is a thing of which not so very many authors, big or little, have ever set their brethren an example. Some few have had the sweetness or slothfulness of disposition; or the due arrogance of mind; or, let us say, the serene persuasion and conviction bestowed by an impregnable confidence in themselves; or the natural shrewdness which perceives that no book is ever written down but by itself; or such other quality, whichever one is necessary, as has enabled them to look with equanimity and indifference on all the assaults of all their assailants. But it is only a few. In the vast majority of cases, trying like a man—or like a woman, or like a small child—to punish the critic, is what the author prefers to the plan of bearing his own punishment like a man. The better class of the incontinents may say with Pope:

"Should some more sober critic come abroad,
If wrong, I smile; if right, I kiss the rod"—

but, like Pope, it is probable that they go home and write their 'Dunciad.' Disraeli and Bulwer and Thackeray, in denouncing their critics, are but three of a mighty company, including the greatest of the literary sort of all climes and all ages; but so doing they unquestionably are in great danger of committing the kind, not the degree, of the offence which has won for the tribe the epithet *irritabile*, and secured for it no small part of the disregard with which it has been treated. To exempt obviously honest but insufficiently informed critics from the common lot and common advantage

of authors—that of being criticised—would manifestly be absurd; but the task of instructing them, if done by the person originally injured, is sure nine times in ten to be done by a person who believes himself aggrieved, and who labors under all and more than all the difficulties which usually beset the party to a cause in which he has constituted himself judge.

Another case of recent occurrence in England is that of the Honorable Roden Noel. He is the author of at least two books of poems, of both of which it may be said with truth that they are everywhere good enough to justify Mr. Noel himself in liking them, and that they are, on the other hand, bad enough in places to justify a reviewer in disliking them and, as human beings go, pronouncing them generally dislikable. However that may be, Mr. Noel's opinion of what one reviewer at all events really is, he utters in a very outspoken manner; and a calm review of his language would no doubt convince himself that the author who does not pocket the insults of his reviewer will, however he may thus contribute to a failure of justice, run great risk of making himself look ridiculous. The black-hearted reviewer, for his part, can do nothing less than smile the more when he notes the indication that his malice has had the effect he wished; while the reviewer who, like one of the Modoc prisoners, thinks he has a white heart, feels pain indeed at so much misapprehension of motives, but in self-defence qualifies this feeling with one of contempt for the childishness of literary adults.

The production of Mr. Noel's in which he records his opinion of the anonymous reviewer whom he has in mind, is a poem with some very good points and some not so good; he describes in it some scenes of London life which gave him pause and made him stop to think why the Communistic red flag is not hoisted in that city, and why the wretchedness of the enormous Babylon does not some day dash itself against the splendor and opulence and overwhelm them. "There is peace in London," he begins. "Not here as yonder, men blaspheming loud, begrimed with slaughter," and dragging *pétroleuses* through the streets and shooting down the hunted wretches like dogs. Much of similar horror he paints, not the less strongly that he is fond neither of the church nor of the Prussians nor of the "cause of order"; and regards some of the women who fought for the Commune through the famine as more sacred than "the high-born courtezans" who, along those same pavements under which the bodies of the slain were to fester, went "walking and mincing as they go" with "the delicate Agags" of Paris—for our author is not averse to heightening the effect of his picture by using sombre reminiscences of Scriptural poetry and Hebrew fierceness and gloom. But "there is peace in London"; and in this peace the poet visits a squalid and evil den in a foul street, to seek a woman living there. "Well, she's dying here," is the surly answer he gets from a low-browed pariah to whom he addresses his enquiry, and thereupon follows a description in which appears much most hopeless want and misery contrasted sharply with the plethoric and iron-hearted wealth of good society. The device adopted to make the antithesis needfully sharp is to bring into sight, in a near street as respectable as the one in which the dying woman lay was mean, certain representatives of the nobility, the church, and in general the upper classes of English society. But in this tragical picture, with its dark background and its sardonical expression, amid the procession of tyrants and hypocrites, the personage who occupies the most space and calls out the poet's fiercest invective is no less a person than young Mr. Blifil, the reviewer, with his "dust-hued head" (already "from tardy fellow-feeling for his heart" beginning to turn gray), whom Mr. Noel apparently considers as the sworn enemy of authors and their enemy from mere baseness of heart.

Here again it may be said that the tone of certain English journals when discussing many of the questions interesting to Mr. Noel—questions much larger than whether or not a certain volume has or has not been praised by such journals—may well have been at the bottom of his tirade. But the tirade is extremely and personally abusive, and goes into such details of the biography of Blifil as make the conclusion seem unavoidable that we have here another case under the old general rule: an individual of the *genus irritabile* has suddenly found under one hat the dust-hued scalp of a critic, a personal enemy, and a gentleman base by instinct and of deficient intelligence; so he ceases to restrain himself; he remembers that he has been injured and feels injured, and announces the fact to everybody who will listen.

That this world-old feud will ever cease, probably no man can discern. We have only to suggest to the class of Creative Authors to which Mr. Noel and Lord Lytton as a poetical writer belong, that one thing they may do which, much as they have pondered on this subject, they probably have never done, and the doing of which in a spirit of humility will conduce more than they think to their edification and peace. The text may be taken from one of the best writers on certain important topics that this country has ever produced, and it is much to be hoped that heed may be given it on this side the water as well as elsewhere: "It is but a small part,

and that by no means the best part, of what passes in the mind of a writer that he can express in his writings, and every writer worthy of the name feels that his happiest efforts fall infinitely short of his ideal and express only the least, and perhaps the least worthy, part of himself. Every really great man, every man of real genius as an author, reads over, if read over he can, with a deep feeling of humiliation, the best things he has written." This is strongly expressed, and there is perhaps some exaggeration in it. One might urge in opposition the saying of Aristotle, that there is no workman who so enjoys his work in the doing of it and after it is done as the poet; and probably this may be true of great poets as well as small. But exaggeration or not, there is much profitable truth in what we have quoted: "Every writer worthy of the name feels that his happiest efforts fall infinitely short of his ideal." The point which it may be well here to make is that the Creative Author's "ideal" is often and usually the "ideal" of the critical author also. For criticism may be looked upon as mercenary, malicious assassination by personal enemies—as cats kill vermin; or we may take that view of it which says of literature, "All literature is a criticism on life," and which habitually considers life, Creative literature, and the other kind of literature to be a mutually interdependent and interacting system of factors, no one of more importance than either of the others. Each is to be tried by the "ideal" above referred to, and the Creative author may be, probably often is, no better able to do this than the critic who declares him to have blundered. Indeed, he may be far less able. As the pessimist considers himself a wiser fellow than the man with an optimistic cosmogonical theory, because the latter, were he wise as he should be, would see that his theory did not cover the facts, so the critic, hearing more of the "celestial syrens' harmony," and refusing to frame inadequate imitations of it, may deduce from his own refusal the inadequacy of the Creative Author's imitations, and with justice regard himself as the more competent judge of the two. Of two astronomers disputing as to the value of their respective opinions on the Copernican system, the one would doubtless decline to attach additional weight to the views of the other because the latter had been up with Professor Donaldson in a balloon and the former had not. The argument may here be obscure to the verse-producer who resents being told by other students of the "ideal" that his work is bad. But its end will be answered if the Creative Author, abandoning his blinded understanding merely, will contemplate with the eye of faith the propositions that of the relation of what he creates to an ideal standard he, in spite of his Creative power, sometimes knows more and sometimes far less than the non-creating author—or, as he is misleadingly called in Creative circles, the destructive author. Less nonsense would be talked on this vexed subject if it were more commonly recollected that, Creative or Destructive, it is very commonly just two equally qualified persons talking about one thing and from the same point of view.

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF PROSPER MÉRIMÉE.*

II.

PARIS, Jan. 2, 1874.

AFTER six years of correspondence, Mérimée finds it rather ridiculous that he should not be allowed to see his correspondent. "You ought to see me," he says, "were it only to get out of the atmosphere of flattery which surrounds you." But since I wrote my first letter on the letters of Mérimée, I have been able to discover the reasons which kept him and his correspondent apart. The "inconnue" is known, at least by a few people. She was born, if I am not mistaken, in Boulogne; not in England, but in a semi-English atmosphere. She was French by birth, the daughter of a small banker, but she was educated among English people, and Mérimée always treats her as if she were an Englishwoman. As a girl, she once wrote to Mérimée to ask him for an autograph; her letter pleased him, and a correspondence began between them. The death of her father left her poor, and she was obliged to enter the household of a Lady H—, and to follow her as a companion to Paris, to Italy, in all her journeys. This is the reason why Mérimée could not visit her. At one time, she was on the point of marrying, but the marriage fell to the ground, and she lives now with a brother, who has a high rank in the French army. I am not at liberty to give you her name, as she has thought it necessary to conceal it, but knowing some of the best friends of Mérimée, I can almost answer for the truth of the preceding details. Mérimée spoke seldom of her to anybody; he was a very shy and discreet man, and he naturally felt little inclination to put anybody in the confidence of a friendship which had become very intimate, but could not end in marriage, as he had made a vow never to marry. Many of the details of the correspondence, which seemed unpleasant if addressed to a lady of great rank or fortune, seem much more natural, and do more credit to Mérimée, when we remember that he had made himself the faithful cor-

* See the Nation of Jan. 8, p. 23.

respondent of a poor girl who could do nothing for him, and who could gratify his ambition in no way.

The two volumes read much better when you have the conducting thread in your hands; you enjoy the irritation of a perpetual puzzle, and are able to see in the correspondence a faithful mirror of the opinions of a great man. The continual flirtation seems only a sort of literary trick, like the love-letters which are intermixed in Montesquieu's 'Lettres persanes.' In the winter of 1842, they meet several times in Paris at the Louvre. He is already a candidate for the French Academy, and writes to her, "If the cholera comes back, I shall perhaps get my *fautuil*." He was elected in March, 1843. That period seems to have marked the height of a sentiment which was then more like love than friendship. After a long excursion in the country, he writes to her, "You ask me if I believe in the soul. Not much. Still, I find an argument for this hypothesis: How could two inanimate substances give and receive a sensation by a union which would be insipid if it were not for the idea attached to it? This is a very pedantic phrase for saying that when two people in love kiss each other, they feel something different from what they would if they kissed satin." He often scolds her, calls her "one of those chilly women of the north," but never proposes to her.

In the summer of 1843, he starts on one of the yearly journeys he makes as Inspector of Historical Monuments. Often, when the night comes, he writes from one of the little country inns where he stops. He visits Vézelay, Saint-Lupicin, in the mountains of the Jura. After his first archaeological journey he becomes a candidate for the Academy of Inscriptions. He goes to Avignon, "an admirable country, but the people are stupid. Nobody, from the man who wears a black coat to the porter, opens his mouth except to speak well of himself." No country, he says, so much resembles Spain. "Everywhere the smell of garlic and oil is married to the smell of orange and jasmine." There are charming touches of this sort everywhere, always in the quaint, ironical manner of Mérimée. The palace of the Popes is a model of fortification of the Middle Ages. There are rooms which were used for the Inquisition. The inhabitants are as proud of their Inquisition as the English of their Magna Charta. "We also," they say, "we have had our auto-da-fé, and the Spaniards only had them after us." He describes the Comtat, and Marseilles. "Dirty and pretty is the description of the Marseillais. They all have physiognomy, beautiful black eyes, fine teeth, very small feet, and imperceptible ankles. These small feet are in brown stockings of the color of the Marseilles mud, coarse, and mended with cotton of twenty different shades. Their gowns are ill-made and soiled. Their beautiful hair shines with tallow—with all this, they are ravishing."

On his return to Paris he was elected a member of the Academy of Inscriptions. Some time afterwards, his public reception into the French Academy took place. The correspondence shows him in 1845 in Spain; he reads manuscripts in the libraries. "I find this country much changed, since my last journey. The people whom I had left friends are mortal enemies." He was an intimate friend of Madame de Montijo, the mother of the Empress Eugénie, and spent much time at her house playing with the young girl who was to become his sovereign. From Spain he runs to Germany. "The German architects seem to me worse than ours. They have spoiled the Minster at Bonn, and they have painted the Abbey of Laar so as to make your teeth ache. The scenery of the Moselle is too much vaunted. . . . All the rich people here, after having dined at one, take tea and cakes at four, eat a little bread with tongue in a garden, which allows them to wait till eight, when they enter a hotel and have supper."

The Revolution of 1848 fills him with disgust and shame. "In the midst of my sorrow, I feel more than anything the stupidity of this nation. It is unequalled. I don't know whether it will be possible to lead her away from the savage ferocity in which she has so great a propensity to revel." This was written after the bloody days of June, 1848. Lady H—and her companion had of course left Paris. At the end of 1848, the correspondence ceases for two years; it opens again only in June, 1850, when Mérimée writes from London: "I dined yesterday," he says, "with a bishop and a dean who make a socialist of me. The bishop belongs to what the Germans call the rationalist school; he does not believe what he preaches, and, providing he wears a black apron, he can eat his five or six thousand pounds a year and spend his time in reading Greek. . . . All the women seem to me in wax. . . . I spent the morning, yesterday, in the new House of Commons. We have no idea of what can be done with a total absence of taste, and two million pounds sterling. . . . I am afraid of becoming quite a socialist in eating too good dinners in gold plate, and seeing people who win fourteen thousand pounds at Epsom. But there is no probability yet that a revolution will break out here. The servility of the poor seems strange to our democratic ideas."

Mérimée writes always in this vein on England. "I have spent two days

at Cambridge and Oxford, and, all things considered, I prefer the Capucins." He does not admire what he calls the perpendicular architecture and the equally perpendicular habits of the natives. He is particularly angry with a fellow who offered him at luncheon a fish four inches long on a great silver plate, a cutlet of lamb on another, and two potatoes on a carved wooden platter. "I never suffered so much from hunger."

After a visit he made in 1856 to the Duke of Hamilton, in Scotland, and a description of the castle, he adds: "I see now why the French are in such request in foreign parts. They take pains to amuse themselves, and by so doing they amuse others. I felt myself the most amusing member of our large company, and I felt conscious that I was not much so." He enjoys the British Museum and the conversation of Panizzi more than anything else. He had become at that time a senator of the Empire. His young friend at Madrid was the Empress, and I know that she often said, "I have but two real friends in France, Mérimée and M. de L—." The author of 'Colomba' became a courtier, and often, as he himself writes (in English), made a fool of himself. He applauds the Italian war, and says "our people have an admirable *entrain*. The little shopkeepers are warlike; the masses take a great interest in the crisis, and wish for our success. The *salons* are perfectly anti-French, and, what is more, arch-mad. They believe that they can come to power again, and that their *burgresses* can continue their speeches interrupted in 1848. Poor people! who don't see that after this there is nothing but the republic, anarchy, and rapine." Mérimée, as you see, had become a true Imperialist. He in reality hated parliamentary institutions. He believed that a Cæsar alone could keep off the evil day of a new republic. He despised those whom he familiarly called the *burgresses*, the men of the Broglie and Guizot school. But his Empire did not always win victories, and the war system which it inaugurated in order to console the French with the loss of their liberties ended at Sedan. Mérimée liked the emotion of war. "We have lived too long like Sybarites. We must go back to the philosophy of our fathers. Some danced at Paris, while others fought in Germany, and this lasted more than twenty years. Now, wars cannot last so long, because the revolution interferes, and because they cost too much money."

Mérimée always shows a clear understanding of Germany. At the beginning of the Italian war he says: "Germany is furious with us. It is a movement similar to that of 1813. . . . Germany is in a great fermentation, but, to all appearances, there will be more beer drunk than blood shed. Prussia resists as much as she can the pressure of the *Franzosen-fresser*. They say now that they must retake not only Alsace but the German provinces of Russia." He takes a great interest in the Pan-Slavic agitation, and his friend Tourgueneff keeps him well informed of the sentiments of the Russian people. He has a very clear head. He prophesies that peace will be made directly between the two Emperors, Napoleon and Francis Joseph; writes these lines before the great triumphs of Moltke: "Nobody understands yet the new mode of warfare with railways, telegraphic lines, and rifled guns." After the peace of Villafranca began the long agitation for Italian unity. The attacks against the Papacy produced naturally a reaction in favor of the Pope among many of the enemies of the Empire. Mérimée, who was a Voltairian, says: "I believe that everybody is become mad except the Emperor, who resembles those shepherds of the Middle Ages who made the wolf dance with a magic flute. The French Academy, which was Voltairian a few years ago, is on the point of selecting the Abbé Lacordaire as a protest against the violence offered to the Pope. It is all one to me. So long as I shall not be obliged to hear their sermons, they can make Academicians of all the members of the Holy College."

Mérimée, who suffered all his life from asthma, was spending more and more time at Cannes. He goes from time to time to England, however. His letters from that country are always very interesting. "I don't remember the name of my host yesterday. When they have white neckties and black coats, all Englishmen are alike. . . . The volunteers are even more absurd than our national guard, because everybody here has a seriousness which you don't find elsewhere. I know a very nice gentleman of 76 years who drills every day in Zouave trousers." The senate was to him only a sinecure. He made a speech once. "I had a horrible fear, but I got the best of it by thinking that I was in the presence of two hundred imbeciles." He was always a great favorite at Fontainebleau, at Compiègne, wherever the Empress was; and he had grown quite fond of the Emperor himself, who was very kind and amiable to him. His politics can be summed up in two words—Caesarism and Voltairianism. He had but one strong passion: he hated the *dévôts*, the papalini, the clericals; Napoleon seemed to him a representative of liberalism.

I wish I could have done better justice to these two volumes; but it is very difficult to analyze a correspondence. On every page there is some happy word or idea; but all is disconnected and thrown in disorder. I have

arrived at the end without giving any account of Mérimée's latter days. I can only advise my readers to go to the volumes themselves, if they are fond of good, racy French and of the *barbarage* of a wit and a thinker.

Correspondence.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND SCIENTIFIC EDUCATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The character of the *Nation* for accuracy, ability, and fairness has made it a favorite visitor in the families of perhaps a majority of the best-educated Catholics in the country. So far as the writer knows, it has among them a larger circulation than any other secular paper. The same sterling qualities that recommend it to others recommend it to them. The *Nation* has this additional recommendation, however, to Catholics: it considers it no part of its mission to abuse them, and, while it by no means represents them—which Catholics neither expect nor desire—it does not, as a general rule, misrepresent them.

This is the reputation of the *Nation* with Catholics. An article in your issue of the 1st has done much to shake it. I refer to an editorial on "The Catholic Church and Scientific Education." It is not necessary here to rehearse the contents of that article, as you are familiar with it. Of the facts concerning the memorial of the graduates of the Irish University to Cardinal Cullen and the Irish Bishops therein referred to, I know nothing but what I have learned from the *Nation*. There certainly was nothing improper or un-Catholic in such a memorial. If disrespectful or impudent, as you seem to think it was, it was to that extent un-Catholic, but no further. It is certainly nothing out of the way for a Catholic, or a number of Catholics, to ask that science shall be taught in a Catholic university as effectively as in any other. It seems to me, however, that you have misunderstood the spirit of the memorialists. By your own showing, they complain of two things:

1st. That the study of science in the Irish Catholic University is not sufficiently provided for.

2d. That no provision is made for the instruction of lay-students in theology.

Taking these two subjects of complaint together, it is clear that what the memorialists desired was a more universal study of theology, and a more thorough study of science; of theology by the lay-students of the university, and of science by both lay and clerical. They probably understood that scientists frequently rejected theology because they knew nothing of it, and theologians science for a like reason. Their position it seems to me is this: that a Catholic University student should be instructed in the science of his religion—if it may be permitted to use the word science here—also in the natural sciences, and that ample provision should be made for both. So much for the memorial and memorialists. I now pass to a few assertions made by the *Nation*, and calculated to place Catholics in a false light with its readers. You say: "The Pope has pronounced damnable and erroneous nearly all the methods and opinions by which Irish or any other Catholics could escape that deficiency in scientific knowledge which they find so injurious and degrading." I know of no "opinion" by which Irish or any other Catholics can obtain knowledge of "methods" than on the inductive and deductive. Which of these has the Pope condemned? And in what words? Until the *Nation* can quote from the "Syllabus" the words in which the condemnation is couched, I must assert that the Pope never did condemn any "method" by which knowledge can be obtained.

Again, you say, "There are no pious Catholic scientific men, and never will be." This is so extravagant an assertion that, had I not seen it in the columns of the *Nation*, it would be hard to persuade me it could there be found. I wonder what Professor Sullivan, to whom you refer, and who, I suppose, is an "Irish Catholic," would say to this, or Mr. Mivart—neither of whom is German, French, or Italian, or belongs to that class of Catholic savans whom you describe as carrying on their investigations without taking the trouble to make a formal repudiation of the church's authority. How the *Nation* ever accumulated the data to warrant the generalization that there never was and never will be a pious Catholic scientist, I do not know, nor do I care to deny it; for if I point out a Catholic who is a savant, I do not know how I could prove him "pious" to the satisfaction of the *Nation*.

Another point to which I would call attention is this. You say: "Mathematics and astronomy she [the Catholic Church] looks on with favor, . . . and we venture to assert that these are the only fields of science in which any Catholic layman can attain distinction without forfeiting his standing in the eyes of the clergy." It is true that mathematics and astronomy are cultivated by Catholics in preference to other sciences. I think the reason to be that there is less room for uncertainty or doubt in them. The positive-

ness of his religion gives the Catholic a love for the positive in science. But there is nothing in "descriptive geometry, comparative anatomy, mineralogy, etc.," at variance with Catholic teaching. Chemistry, geology, botany, zoölogy, philology, optics, etc., are taught in almost every Catholic college in America. If provision for them is not in some institutions as good as it might be, it is owing to a lack of funds, not to a lack of disposition on the part of Catholics to teach or learn these sciences.

There is one other point to which I would advert. The *Nation* in this same article seems to endorse Bismarck's course towards the Catholic Church in Germany, in the matter of clerical education at least, for the reason that the German statesman is "well aware that in no seminary or college controlled by priests, is there any chance he [the student] will receive the best instruction of the day on the subjects in which the modern world is most interested." To afford the best instruction of the day is not the reason of Bismarck's interference with the Catholic Church in Germany. But, suppose it were, is the *Nation* ready to advocate the principle that the state may disregard the right of an ecclesiastical organization to prescribe a curriculum for its candidates for orders, and compel it to give them what it considers "the best instruction of the day"; or that the state is even the judge of what is such best instruction? Has the government of the State of New York the right to prescribe what studies a candidate for ordination in the Methodist Church must pursue? Ought it to have it?

While the Catholic Church does not consider it its primary end and aim to advance the interests of science, it always has and still does favor its advance. True, it will not allow what it considers divine truth to be called in question by its adherents. There is not a fact of science which Catholics may not accept. There is a theory or two which may possibly conflict with its teachings. But even the *Darwinian theory* the Catholic Church does not condemn. Catholics, as a rule, reject it. Catholics, like Mivart, endorse the theory of evolution, and do not forfeit the good opinion of the clergy. Whether the Catholic Church will formally condemn it or not, the future will decide.

Respectfully,

A CATHOLIC.

January 5, 1874.

[What the memorialists of the Catholic University desired, "A Catholic" can hardly know well enough to explain to us without having read it. The demand for theological instruction was a mere mention suggested by Dr. Newman. We shall now explain to him that induction and deduction are of no value for scientific purposes without liberty in the collection of facts, which we again assert a pious Catholic cannot enjoy. Complete liberty, and constant and open-minded diligence in the collection of facts, are the beginning and end of all scientific processes. Induction or deduction without this is a mere word-juggle. The history of the Catholic Church, as everybody knows, bristles with illustrations of her hostility to this liberty. We shall not, however, go very far back for proof of the correctness of our position. In the Encyclical Letter of December 8, 1864, the Pope confirmed all former bulls and monitions directed against scientific and religious heresies, and condemned particularly the doctrine that "citizens have full liberty to manifest loudly and publicly their opinions by speech, printing, or otherwise, without restraint on the part of civil or ecclesiastical authority." Article 5 of the Syllabus which accompanied this, declares erroneous "the belief that Divine revelation is imperfect, and subject to a continuing and indefinite progress corresponding to the advancement of human reason." Article 12 denounces as erroneous the belief "that the Apostolic See and the Roman Congregation obstruct the free progress of science." They have, nevertheless, denounced the Copernican system of astronomy, and Cardinal Cullen has maintained in a paper edited by him in Rome that the earth stands still. Art. 80 denounces as erroneous the doctrine that "the Roman Pontiff may and ought to reconcile himself with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization." The Council of the Vatican, moreover, has anathematized anybody who "maintains that human sciences ought to be treated with such liberty that their assertions may be taken for true, even when they are contrary to revealed doctrine, or that the church cannot proscribe them." Also, "anybody who maintains that it is possible that one might, owing to the progress of science, sometimes attribute to the dogmas of the church a different sense from that in which the church understands them." To understand all this properly, we must refer to the

Bull of October 12, 1870, revising the offences for which persons are liable to excommunication. This instrument consigns to everlasting damnation all persons who possess or read any books condemned by the Congregation, or, in other words, to be found on the 'Index.' Among these, to mention a few, are Bacon's 'De Augmentis,' Gibbon's 'Rome,' Combe's 'Phrenology,' Robertson's 'Charles V.,' Montaigne's 'Essays,' Raspail's 'Chimie Organique,' Montesquieu's 'Esprit des Loix,' and Botta's 'History of Italy.' Whether Darwin's books or Lyell's or Tyndall's have been added to the list we are unable to say, but we ourselves have no doubt of it. If "A Catholic" possesses any of the above works, we are enabled to inform him, and we do so with sincere regret, that he will be damned eternally. We did not assert that "there were no pious Catholic scientific men"—we said none "of note." Professor Sullivan is not a scientific man "of note." And we assert that any Catholic scientific man who strictly complies with the decrees of the church is untrustworthy, and that, if he does not comply with them, he is *pro tanto* a bad Catholic, and will go to hell. As to Bismarck's object in compelling clerical students to pass through secular universities, we have nothing to add to what we have already said except this, that the State of New York does not supply university education or exact it of anybody; does not pay Methodist clergymen; and that the Methodist Church has not declared that, in case of a legal conflict between church and state, the law of the church ought to prevail (Syll. Art. 42); that science ought not to be exempt from ecclesiastical jurisdiction (Art. 63); that the Methodist Church ought to be the sole religion of the state to the exclusion of all others; that it is improper to make provision in Methodist countries for the public worship of other sects (Arts. 77, 78); that man is not free to embrace and profess the religion which seems to him, under the guidance of reason, to be true (Art. 15); or that the Methodist Church ought not to reconcile itself with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization (Art. 80); that kings and princes are subject to the jurisdiction of the said church, which is superior to them when questions of jurisdiction have to be decided (Art. 54); and that it has not drawn up a list of books, including many of the masterpieces of modern literature, historical and scientific, and forbidden its members to keep or read them on pain of eternal torment. If it had done and said all this, and had got into such a quarrel with the state as now rages between Prussia and the Church, we might be led into the advocacy of some strange measures. At present, being merely lookers-on, we content ourselves with believing that Bismarck knows what Germany needs.—ED. NATION.]

PINE'S PORTRAIT OF GARRICK.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There hung for a while some years ago at the Century Club in your city, and perhaps still hangs there, a portrait of David Garrick, painted by R. E. Pine, which at that time belonged to Mr. A. M. Cozzens, and had previously been owned by Major Hone. The latter got it of Joseph Tyler of the old Park Theatre, who had known Garrick, and whose wife had been a member of the Drury Lane Company under Garrick's management. In 1857, Mr. Julian C. Verplanck read a paper before the Sketch Club in which he traced the history of this picture, and assigned a meaning to the action of the figure, which is a quarter-length, with the left hand pressed upon the heart. He quoted from Tom Davies's 'Life of Garrick' the speech which the great actor delivered on retiring in 1776, and in the final clause Davies represents that Garrick "here put his hand to his heart." On this evidence Mr. Verplanck interpreted the action of the portrait, identifying the costume as that of *Don Felix* in "The Wonder," the part Garrick played on that evening. He consequently argued that the portrait must have been painted between 1776 and 1779, the latter year being that of Garrick's death. Mr. Verplanck's paper was printed at the time in the *Crayon*, and subsequently in separate form for private circulation, the latter issue being accompanied by a photograph of the portrait.

In the large collection of prints which belongs to the Barton Library, and which was purchased with the books for this institution, we have found a number of likenesses of Garrick, and among them a large engraving, 17½ x 42½ inches, published by Boydell in 1784, dedicated to Mrs. Montague, en-

graved by Caroline Watson after a painting by R. E. Pine. The inscription "Garrick" is followed by these lines from the ode which Garrick delivered at the Stratford Jubilee in 1769:

"Can British gratitude delay
To him, the glory of this Isle,
To give the festive day,
The song, the statue, the devoted pile,
To him, the first of poets, best of men?
'We ne'er shall look upon his like again!'"

The picture represents a statue of Shakespeare on a pedestal, surrounded by *Leary*, *Macbeth*, *Falstaff*, and the other Shakespearian characters whom Garrick describes in the ode. In the foreground stands the actor himself, in the costume of his day, his right hand raised and pointing to the statue. If you drop this arm and cut the figure off just below the left hand, which is pressed to the breast, you have in what is left a counterpart in costume, expression, and action of the New York portrait, which is thus proved to be a duplication by the artist of the head and upper body of the central figure in his larger painting, with no variation but the lowering of the right arm. The address, then, is the Shakespeare ode and not the farewell speech. The costume is not that of *Don Felix*, but a gentleman's attire of that day. The date, is probably subsequent to 1784—after Garrick's death—though the date of the engraving does not render this certain. That the New York portrait was subsequent to the larger picture is pretty evident from a curious point of the portrait. The full-length represents Garrick wearing the Shakespeare medal given him at Stratford in 1769, suspended from his neck by a ribbon; and although the medal itself fell too far below the hand upon the heart to be included on the canvas in the smaller painting, the ribbon is still there above the hand.

JUSTIN WINSOR.

SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE, PUBLIC LIBRARY, BOSTON, Jan. 17, 1874.

Notes.

THE *Independent* contradicts explicitly the rumor lately spread concerning its sale to new proprietors.—The *Life, Reminiscences, and Personal Recollections of Edwin Forrest*, by James Rees, is announced by T. B. Peterson & Bros. We presume the reminiscences and recollections to be Mr. Rees's and not Mr. Forrest's, though the title is ambiguous.—Petermann's *Mittheilungen* for November 27, the index number of the volume, contains a long article contributed by Mr. Albert S. Gatschet, of this city, on the exploration of Northwestern Texas in 1872. This exploration was undertaken on behalf of the Texas Land and Copper-mining Association, and Mr. Gatschet's compilation is from the reports of Mr. A. R. Roessler, the geologist, mineralogist, and meteorologist, and Dr. O. Loew, the chemist and botanist, employed by the company. A map of the greater part of Texas is accompanied by one on a larger scale showing the route of the expedition and the geological formation of the northern counties of the State. Coal measures were found to extend from the Red River across the upper Brazos and indefinitely southward. Another map is of the North Atlantic, showing the track of the *Challenger*, with the soundings recorded, and also (by tints) the broad divisions of the Atlantic according to depth.—The *Literary World* states that Mr. Wm. A. Wheeler, Assistant Superintendent of the Boston Public Library, in cataloguing the newly-added Barton Library, has been led to feel the need of and to undertake to prepare a Cyclopædia of Shakespearian Literature, designed to elucidate the biography of the poet, the antiquities, geography, topography, political and natural history, and bibliography of his works, and the lives and writings of his editors, translators, commentators, and critics. Mr. Wheeler expects the co-operation of eminent Shakespearian scholars.

—The *American Naturalist* for January, rather late in its appearance, is an excellent number of a periodical which does great credit to the country as well as to the little band of naturalists at Salem, Mass., who edit it—mainly, we suppose, as a labor of love. For, as the oldest scientific journal in the land is said barely to pay its way, probably no more can be said of this one, which now enters upon its eighth year. Surely it deserves success, and a patronage beyond the range of the small body of working naturalists. For one thing, it is capably printed. In typography and in its illustrations it surpasses any of the scientific journals of the sort we know of, except the French *Annales des Sciences Naturelles*. The articles are mainly original. There is one selected article in the present number, and an excellent one it is, namely, the greater part of Professor Allman's address before the Biological Section of the British Association on the present aspects of biology and the method of biological study. It is mainly a very searching and impartial examination of "the descent theory" by a veteran zoölogist. Among the other readable articles is the first part of "Notes from the Journal of a Botanist in Europe" (Dr. Farlow), a narrative of a visit to Lund, Stockholm,

and Upsal, the home of Linnæus. The most pretentious article is that on the relationship between development and sexual condition in plants, or, as the running title has it, "On the Origin of Sex," by Dr. John Stockton-Hough, which in matter and form is rather too high for us, and is even offensive in its superabundant foot-note references to other writings by the same author. In the way of reviews and book-notices, that of Professor Morse's "Memoir on the Brachiopods" gives the essential substance of the paper and forty of the neat illustrative woodcuts. We have heard that a posthumous article by Agassiz is to appear in the February number.

—The twenty-eighth volume of the *Historical and Genealogical Register*, Boston, is begun in the number for January-March, 1874, which is printed from new type and on heavier paper than heretofore. Capt. Geo. Henry Preble, U. S. N., contributes an interesting paper on "Three Historic Flags and Three September Victories"—these latter being of the *Bon Homme Richard* over the *Serapis*, the *Enterprise* over the *Boxer*, and the repulse of the British fleet which bombarded Fort Mifflin, September 10, 1814. The flag which waved over this fort was the one which inspired the composition of our national anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner." The author's latest version of this song, from his own handwriting, is given by Capt. Preble, with the various readings. A very curious anecdote is told in connection with the *Enterprise* and *Boxer* engagement. Mr. Charles Tappan, the venerable surviving brother of Arthur and Lewis Tappan, was a Boston merchant at the outbreak of the war of 1812. Such was then the condition of our manufactures that, to use Mr. Tappan's own words, our soldiers "were clad in British cloths and slept under British blankets." "It was understood no captures would be made of British goods owned by citizens of the United States, and many American merchants imported, via Halifax and St. John, N. B., their usual stock of goods." In 1813, Mr. Tappan made a venture of this kind in a brig flying Swedish colors, which left St. John in September for Bath, Me., where the goods were to be entered and duty regularly paid on them. As American privateers were the only enemies to be dreaded, Mr. Tappan and his associates engaged H. B. M. Brig *Boxer* to convoy the *Margaretta*, and in return for this service Capt. Blyth received a bill of exchange on London for £100. When near the mouth of the Kennebec, the *Boxer*, as had been agreed upon, to avert suspicion, fired two or three guns as if in pursuit of its charge. Unluckily, the sound reached the ears of Lieut. Burrows, commanding the U. S. Brig *Enterprise*, which the day before had left Portland for a cruise eastward, and coming up with the *Boxer* on the 5th was immediately engaged in a sanguinary conflict, fatal to both commanders, and resulting in the capture of the *Boxer*. "Our bill of exchange," says Mr. Tappan, "we thought might in some way cause us trouble, and we employed Esquire K. to take five hundred specie dollars on board the captured ship and exchange them for the paper, which was found in Capt. Blyth's breeches pocket."

—We have been favored by Gen. Francis A. Walker with an inspection of several of the charts on which, under a special appropriation of the last Congress, he is engaged in illustration of the Census of 1870. There are to be some fifty of these in all, of the same nature as those bound up with the Census volumes, but much superior to them in the quality of their execution and in fulness of detail, the scale being much enlarged (folio page instead of quarto). Among the entirely new subjects for graphic representation are the river and basin systems of the United States; the meteorological physiognomy of the country as deduced by the Signal Service Bureau; the relative (as well as absolute) statistics of such elements as foreign nationality, illiteracy, etc.; foreign parentage (as well as foreign birth); birth-rate; preponderance of sex, etc., etc. In the four charts already finished of enteric, cerebro-spinal, and typhus fevers; malarial diseases; intestinal diseases; and consumption, the shading for degree of prevalence is accompanied by figures giving the density of population, thus controlling at once and reinforcing the information conveyed by the tints alone. Another map also completed, of double size (about 29x20 inches), "showing, in five degrees of density, the distribution, within the territory of the United States, of the Constitutional population," is a beautiful specimen of this new series, the excellence of the engraving and color-printing being highly creditable to the establishment of Mr. Julius Bien. Comparing this with the "Density of Population" chart of the Ninth Census, it is evident how much greater pains have been taken with the physical outlines, and to what an extent the computations on which the shading is based have been revised. It is, in fact, a quite original work; and the same, we believe, may be said not only of the engraving, but of Gen. Walker's part in all the maps whose subject-matter has already been illustrated in the Census volumes. On the labor of these revisions and of the fresh calculations we need not dwell; few persons will ever appreciate it. The atlas will, if we are not mistaken, be accompanied by a certain amount of letterpress, and will do honor to the liberality and

intelligence of our Government—as most of its scientific publications have done. Its appearance may be looked for in the course of the next few months, but ten years (we reflect) must elapse before a companion atlas will enable us to judge of the changes wrought by the present decade in the social and material conditions of the Republic. This is as good an opportunity as we are likely to have of recommending for general reading Gen. Walker's essay on "Some of the Results of the Census of 1870" ("Transactions of the American Social Science Association," No. V., and also printed separately in pamphlet form by Hurd & Houghton).

—In the death of Mr. Charles Astor Bristed American literary culture and scholarship have sustained no slight loss; while in the social circles of more than one of our cities he will be sincerely regretted as a man of unusual social qualities and abilities, which he exercised liberally and freely. His father was an English clergyman, who, coming to this country after reaching man's estate, married the daughter of Mr. John Jacob Astor, thus of course securing for his family eventual wealth. To the fact that his father was an Englishman it is probably due that the son was sent to England to receive a part of his education, and there so strengthened what we may suppose his natural inherited liking for English ways as for a good while after his return to be looked upon with a certain suspicion by some of his countrymen. Having, however, all the courage of his convictions, and there being no particular reason why he should not act upon them, this suspicion was never greatly operative on Mr. Bristed's conduct or opinions. These were as entirely independent and outspoken—though never, we believe, the cause of any very bad blood—as the more belligerent behavior of Mr. Bristed's distinguished compatriot, Fenimore Cooper. To the end of his days he was as ready to send to the *Times* or the *Evening Post* a letter about the rude impoliteness of his fellow-citizens, the intellectual insufficiency of a popular statesman, the horribleness of the American *cuisine*, as ever Mr. Cooper was ready to bring an action at law against a book critic for charging him with malice against certain of his countrymen. This kind of courage and independence Mr. Bristed may be said to have had in a degree that was exemplary, and it must be confessed that the example was not and is not wholly unneeded. That these qualities were always put in action in a thoroughly judicious manner or upon an absolutely necessary occasion would not, we suppose, be said by any one. No doubt Mr. Bristed was in some degree a man to be called whimsical; and as he could usually indulge his whim, whether of conduct or of intellectual eccentricity; as his energy was restless, and as his sense of humor was not strong enough to temper his eagerness and partly supply the place of the mental balance which he lacked, it followed that various things of his, done and written, were proofs of his intrepidity and energy rather than of his sound judgment. It is, however, neither in the society of New York and Washington nor as a man of attainments uncommon among American gentlemen that Mr. Bristed will be missed by most of our readers. It is the fugitive literature of American magazines and reviews and newspapers that principally loses in his death. Among other journals to which he was a contributor was our own, where his contributions were always welcome; but his far more frequent and we may add somewhat more characteristic productions appeared under the well-known pseudonym of "Carl Benson" in the *Galaxy*, the *Evening Post*, the *Times*, the *Turf, Field and Farm*, the *Spirit of the Times*, *Fraser's Magazine*, the *Clipper*, the *Round Table*, the *Knickerbocker Magazine*, and, we dare say, in a dozen or a score of other publications, some living and some dead, some worth writing for, and some which he thought worth writing for, because society was full of cant, and because no gentleman need refrain from writing about chess or salmon merely because the journal for which he wrote was one that habitually contained accounts of cock-mains and prize-fights. His topics were multifarious, for he was a social philosopher and a man of letters who was ready to write on any subject, however small, and was fitted by a careful education and a wide acquaintance with "many men and many cities" to write well and instructively on some subjects really of importance and on many of more or less of interest. Often the subject was trifling and the outcome, whether as regards philosophy, or knowledge, or good taste, was of a value strictly commensurate; but still there was almost invariably something to repay one for reading, unless, indeed, we consider our author's poetry. This, however, was mainly confined to private circulation. It gave curious and highly convincing illustration of the fact that a clever man may in this field make a radical mistake in estimating his capacities. In prose, as we have said, "Carl Benson's" topics were multifarious: Whether there is any English rhyme for "Dieppe"; what is Plato's true place among philosophers—is it not a low one? the correct pedigree of a certain race-horse; a reason why the French use small-swords in duelling and not pistols; an explication of a dubious passage in Lucretius; an anecdote of Lola Montez; a reason why it is probable that Dr. Burdell was killed by a woman and not by a man; the

difference between New York society in 1873 and in the days when Amity Street was the centre of fashion; the principles of Latin prosody; why when two vehicles meet in a New York street each driver bears to the right and not, as in England, to the left; the causes of the early decay of American women; Grote as a historian; the stupidity of the "Aquarians" (people who approve of prohibitory laws about drinking); the oddity of the fact that once all the champagne in New York used to be "Roederer" and at another time "Widow Clicquot," to the entire exclusion of "Roederer"; the fallacy of the "noscitur-a-sociis" maxim (illustrated by a diagram); the real distinction between Philadelphia society and that of Baltimore on one hand and that of Boston on the other; the status of an Oxford fellow before the reform of 1854, as compared with his status after it; the immoral character of the "scientific dispensation"; an enquiry as to whether "Buller of Brazenose" in North's "Noctes" was not a Tory; the cause of the magnitude of the Boston fire of 1872. Any one of these matters might be the subject of an article or a letter from "Carl Benson" in to-day's paper or magazine, and any other one might be the subject of to-morrow's article or letter in some other journal. Of Mr. Bristed's more considerable works, the one best known is his 'Five Years in an English University,' of which a new edition was published, with improvements, in 1873; the one best adapted to be useful is his 'Interference Theory of Government'; and the one most amusing is his 'Pieces of a Broken-down Critic,' now, we think, out of print, and in fact never well into it. Mr. Bristed was born in 1820 in this city.

—An apparent injustice has been done the Medical Department of the army, as we gather from a memorial of the American Medical Association, in that the law of 1869, prohibiting appointments and promotions in all the staff corps, is yet unrepealed, so far as this corps is concerned; and, further, in the grade of rank that it is possible for surgeons to attain even after arduous and very protracted service. The several scientific corps of the army, although necessary to the success and even to the existence of forces in the field, are not as conspicuous as their brethren of the line, and therefore to the popular mind do not seem as essential. But deprived of its properly organized staff, an army would be only a guerilla force that could not be kept together. The Medical Department, whose hygienic and sanitary precautions alone often preserve as many lives as the elaborate lines of the engineers, has had even the slow legitimate promotion that belongs to it in peace held in abeyance for five years, and its latest appointments are of November, 1868. As a consequence, at the date of this memorial, July 4, 1873, there were sixty-one vacancies in an authorized strength of two hundred and seventeen officers. This is an evil whose most direct effect is felt by the army at large; for, while medical officers cannot be commissioned, medical attendance must in some way be supplied; and this is done by hiring such physicians as may be willing to serve for moderate pay and with uncertain tenure.

—There is, however, a ground of complaint which more directly concerns the Medical Department itself. At the request of certain officers, the Medical Association, which represents the faculty of the country, carefully considered the question of the rank allowed the medical corps, and expressed its deliberate opinion that an "odious discrimination" was made against it as compared with other staff corps, and appointed a committee to invite Congressional action upon the matter. Their committee appears to have investigated the subject, and reports that "having once attained the grade of major" (the lowest field-officer's rank), a medical officer has "no further reasonable hope of promotion," and recommends that a surgeon of twenty years' service be given the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and one of thirty years' that of colonel, basing the recommendation on the grades usually attained by that length of service in the other portions of the army. A surgeon who had held the office of Medical Inspector-General, which was created only for and during the rebellion, died in this harbor last spring while on duty with the simple rank of major, a rank that he had attained, after thirteen years' service, before Buena Vista was fought or Vera Cruz fell. There are now on the active list as majors medical officers of more than forty years' service. These men, veterans of the Florida, Mexican, and Civil Wars, have no higher grade than they had already regularly attained before others, who are now colonels by regular promotion, were even graduated from West Point. The recommendation that the senior surgeons be accorded this increased rank seems reasonable, for, as the committee says, it "is the only way in which they can receive that increase of emolument or consideration which ordinarily attends the advancing years of educated physicians in private practice." And there is no reason why the medical should not receive similar official recognition to that accorded the other scientific corps. These are organizations which can be looked upon with pride and pleasure, representing as they do bodies of cultivated men carrying on well specific and important works. Intelligence and fidelity in any branch of the public service should not lack moral or material support.

—The *Almanach de Gotha* for the current year has proved of unusual interest to the Italians. They find in it an announcement of the morganatic marriage of the king with Rosina, Countess of Mirafiori. This does not surprise them as news, for the fact has long been notorious, though there is in Italy no constitutional or legal recognition of the sort of marriage in question. But why the relation, whatever name be given it, should be mentioned at all by the *Almanach*, is not apparent. The scandal is increased by the customary thanks which the editor returns in his preface to the legations of the several countries for accurate information, genealogical, diplomatic, and statistical. The *Opinione* denies that this marriage—an act essentially private, and which has never found a place in the official calendars of the kingdom—could have been reported from an official source to the *Almanach*, and the blame is accordingly laid upon some obscure correspondent, against further employment of whom the editor is solemnly warned.

—The debates on the Prussian Civil-Marriage Bill have been enlivened by a passage between Herr von Gerlach, who is what would be called in our politics a venerable fossil, and Bismarck. The former had considered it pertinent to the matter in hand to cite speeches made by the Premier some twenty or twenty-five years ago, when the two belonged to the same party and were substantially of the same way of thinking. This attention was acknowledged by Bismarck in a psychological delineation of his opponent which will save that gentleman the necessity of ever sitting for his portrait again. Herr von Gerlach, he said, resembled those nabobs who can afford the luxury of a coach or a coat unlike anybody else's, and who take care that nobody else shall get a cut off the same cloth. In the old party days referred to, agreement with Herr von Gerlach was possible only for very short periods, as he manifestly could not bear to feel that any one was of like mind with himself. As soon as he became conscious that such was the fact, his views underwent modification, thus affording a fresh occasion for discussion. Hence he had been in perfect sympathy with none of the historic epochs of Prussia; his criticism had always been of the destructive kind; and he had never let fall a positive declaration, though always promising to do so "next time." At the date when the *Kreuzzeitung* was not unfriendly to Bismarck, Herr von Gerlach used to contribute articles proving the state to be wholly out of joint, and regularly ending in this wise: "What ought now to be done will be discussed in the next article"—but this article never appeared. Whether Bismarck's humor was contagious, or whether Herr von Gerlach himself has a sense of humor, we cannot decide; but the deputy thanked the Prince for his remarks, and for having given evidence that their views were not so widely different after all—"as I shall attempt to show," he said amid the tumultuous laughter of the House, "at the next opportunity."

—Of the many books which have lately appeared about the French, their ways, their habits, or their literature, few are so completely satisfactory as Julian Schmidt's 'Geschichte der Französischen Literatur seit Ludwig XVI. 1774,' a much enlarged and improved second edition of which has just appeared. Julian Schmidt's excellence as a critic is well known; his merits are great thoroughness in the collection and preparation of material, and more especially, if we may be allowed the expression, a "level-headedness" which never deserts him. His style is agreeable and often humorous. Perhaps the most important part of the book is the second volume, in which are discussed the writers who are still living, as well as those recently dead whose influence is yet strongly felt; such are George Sand, Balzac, Alfred de Musset, Victor Hugo, Mérimée, Gautier, etc. It makes no difference of whom he is writing, he never lets himself be led into undue admiration of those qualities which from their strangeness foreigners are accustomed to over-rate. This is very noticeable, for instance, in his treatment of George Sand and Alfred de Musset. Students of modern French literature could have no better guide to show them what is admirable, and to protect them from the sort of intellectual demoralization which very moral people are often capable of under the spell of French novel-writers. It should be said that this history, which, by the way, is sadly in want of an index or a serviceable table of contents, is brought down no later than the *coup d'état*. The succeeding years, we are told, will be studied more or less consecutively in detached essays such as compose the 'Bilder aus dem geistigen Leben unserer Zeit.'

—We in this country have heard more or less of Sardou's play "L'Oncle Sam," which, it was feared, was to serve as a firebrand to the angry passions of two formerly friendly nations. It seems, however, that if such a disastrous result had come about, we should have had only ourselves to blame for our sufferings. According to a valuable contribution to modern history from the pen of M. Albert Wolff, entitled "Victorien Sardou et L'Oncle Sam," it was an American who first suggested the idea of the play to the dramatist. Our countryman, the Reverend Mr. Elliot Barnett, of No. 6 Fifth Avenue (or, as he is commonly called in the book, Sir Elliott Barnett), visited Sardou with a slip from a paper of this city, narrating what it must have called "A Sad Tragedy in High Life." This tragedy was as follows:

"A certain John Stewer, who had been flirting for a long time with a daughter of the old clergyman, Elliot Burnett, at last ran away with her. The grief of Sir Elliot may be imagined. The police sought for the fugitives in vain, but yesterday Sir Elliot came upon the man and shot him dead with a pistol." Sir Elliot wants a play written to revenge the follies of American society, and, not trusting to our own dramatists, he recalls the wonderful success of "La Famille Benoiton" in reforming certain French ways, and starts for Paris to find the man competent for the task. M. Sardou accepts the plan joyfully, and the play is written. Then follows an amusing description of the author's endeavors to get permission from M. Thiers to have the play brought out, and some reflections on the corruption of American society. Flirtation, in particular, comes in for some very plain speaking. M. Wolff does not tell us how much of even the very meagre success which the play had is to be ascribed to the advertising which M. Thiers gave it.

HERBERT SPENCER'S POLEMICS.*

MR. HERBERT SPENCER has two characters. He is the propounder of an elaborate system of philosophy and sociology. He is also a consummate dialectician, and displays a logical skill in criticisms on all opinions opposed to his own. With his constructive theories, which, whatever their defects, are exerting immense influence wherever the English tongue is spoken, we are at present not concerned, nor could an original system of thought be in any case satisfactorily dealt with within the limits of an article. Our object at present is to examine his system of criticism, to which he mainly owes not his influence on thinkers, but his well-deserved and growing popularity. He is a logician of great acuteness and extraordinary dexterity, and his last work, while it contains a good deal of solid and constructive theory, is chiefly an example of his critical or polemical manner. The 'Study of Sociology' might be described as an exposure of the fallacies of thought and of feeling by which men of all classes are incapacitated for the pursuit of sociological truth. Its object is, we take it, rather to arouse the attention of the multitude than to convince philosophical students. Addressed originally to the readers of a magazine, it is admirably adapted for its purpose. The delusions of the multitude, the delusions of the learned, the errors of lawyers, the crotchets of doctrinaires, the errors of divines, the stupidity and incapacity of authors, teachers, bishops, and prime-ministers, are all exposed to the view of Mr. Spencer's readers. No one escapes the lash. All men are convicted of folly, until at last, when you end Mr. Spencer's interesting four hundred and odd pages, you are led to the conclusion that all men are fools, and only wonder that the argument was not made absolutely complete by a final demonstration that your teacher himself suffered from an incurable bias, and that therefore wisdom was not to be found among the children of men. Now the spectacle of Mr. Spencer's warfare on human delusion is to our minds both profitable and a source of rational enjoyment. It is profitable, because it really dispels a vast amount of loose thinking. It is enjoyable, both because a well-conducted fight is always a source of pleasure to a spectator who stands out of the fray, and also because it flatters the vanity of intelligent readers, who unconsciously attribute to themselves the credit of arguments which they have only followed but are quite incapable of inventing. When we see Mr. Froude, Mr. Kingsley, or Mr. Gladstone utterly routed and defeated, it is impossible not to feel for a moment as if we ourselves had devised the logical thrusts and passes by which these eminent persons are disarmed. Yet delight in Mr. Spencer's hard hitting must occasionally be tempered by uneasiness at the very completeness of his triumphs. It is difficult to believe that even erroneous opinions admit of the summary exposure they receive at Mr. Spencer's hands. All men may be fools, but it can hardly be true that all men are patent and self-convicted fools. The question arises whether Mr. Spencer's brilliant polemics are as conclusive as they are certainly striking. The enquiry may be considered apart from the investigation into the truth of his substantive theories, and can be best answered within our space by examining two or three typical examples of his argumentative manner.

Among emotional subjective difficulties in the way of forming just judgments on social matters, Mr. Spencer notes the bias caused by feelings of love and hatred, and generally by men's sympathies and antipathies. As an instance of such bias, he cites the horror caused in England by the Reign of Terror, compared with the lenity displayed in judging of Napoleon's warfare:

"The bloodshed of the Revolution has been spoken of with words of horror; and for those who wrought it there has been unqualified hate. About the enormously greater bloodshed which these wars of the Consulate

and Empire entailed, little or no horror is expressed. . . . See the beliefs which these respective feelings imply:

"Over ten thousand deaths we may fitly shudder and lament. As the ten thousand were slain because of the tyrannies, cruelties, and treacheries committed by them or their class, their deaths are very pitiable." "Two million deaths call for no shuddering or lamentation. As the two millions, innocent of offence, were taken from classes already oppressed and impoverished, the slaughter of them need excite no pity."

Now it appears to us perfectly true that English judgment is somewhat too severe towards the crimes of the Terrorists, and certainly far too lenient towards the crimes of Napoleon. But can it really be maintained that the state of sentiment which Mr. Spencer reprobates implies the existence of the absurd belief in the persons who entertain it which Mr. Spencer attributes to them? Surely not. A man may hold that the executions committed during the Reign of Terror are more horrible than the slaughter of soldiers in war on various grounds. He may decline to adopt the account of the Revolution which Mr. Spencer puts forward. To say that this supposed opponent takes an erroneous view of the facts is not to the purpose, for the question is not, what is the true history of the rule of the Jacobins? but, what are the principles necessarily entertained by all who denounced this rule as worse than that of Napoleon? The opponent may again consider Napoleon's wars as not, in fact, wars of aggression. Grant this to be a mistake, still a mistake of fact prevents Mr. Spencer's proposed *reductio ad absurdum* from applying. An opponent, lastly, may take up a far more tenable position. He may say, "I admit Napoleon's wars to be atrocious, but I maintain that ten thousand deaths may be, under certain circumstances, a far greater evil than two million deaths under other circumstances"; and no one who thinks the unjust condemnation of an innocent man a worse evil than the loss of ten lives in a fight, can deny that such a state of things as the opponent supposes may exist. It is, in short, possible that the person who holds the views Mr. Spencer censures, may hold them on grounds which make it quite impossible to fasten upon him the untenable dogmas Mr. Spencer attributes to him.

But one should further note that Mr. Spencer's line of argument is characterized by a real defect of method. You may attempt to reduce an opponent's reasonings to an absurdity by one of two courses. You may, in the first place, show that, from the premises he admittedly holds, certain conclusions follow which are either palpably absurd or which he himself will not admit. This is the safest mode of proceeding, and, if you are in the right, you may by this method prove either that your opponent holds an absurd view, or else, what is far more often the case, that his premises are wider than he can defend when their true meaning is pointed out. You may, in the second place, show that the principles he holds must be conclusions from absurd premises, or, at any rate, from premises which he would not admit to be true. Now, this second method is a very hazardous one, since, even when an opinion is erroneous, it is almost impossible absolutely to pin its main-tainer to a particular false premise from which it must arise. The number of erroneous premises is indefinite, and, therefore, you cannot logically infer that the erroneous opinion implies the maintenance of any given false premise. A. B., for example, maintains the truth of Papal infallibility. From this opinion you may, combined with propositions which no one can deny, logically deduce startling conclusions, and thereby drive the believer in infallibility either to modify his dogma or to admit that he holds opinions which to most persons seem absurdities. But it would be hazardous to argue that A. B. must believe in a particular interpretation of a given text of Scripture because he believes in Papal infallibility, since, though he may hold his view upon that ground, he may also hold it on various other conceivable grounds. Now, this hazardous course is that which Mr. Spencer seems to have adopted in order to convict Napoleonic worshippers of outrageous absurdity, for he apparently means that their admiration must rest on the principles which he ascribes to them, and he fails in his argument because their admiration may rest upon a host of other considerations of which he does not take account. We have dwelt upon this method of reasoning because he is liable to the charge of frequently attaining by it an argumentative triumph which, when fully examined, will be found unwarrantable. Here, for instance, is an example of a mistake which, if not precisely the same, is very similar to that which we have pointed out. The object of criticism is in this case Gibbon:

"What perverted conceptions of social phenomena this bias [viz., the religion of enmity] produces may be seen in the following passage from Gibbon:

"It is scarcely possible that the eyes of contemporaries should discover in the public felicity the causes of decay and corruption. The long peace and the uniform government of the Romans had introduced a slow and secret poison into the vitals of the Empire."

"In which sentences there is involved the general proposition, that in proportion as men are long held together in that mutual dependence which social co-operation implies, they will become less fit for mutual dependence and co-operation, and society will tend towards dissolution; while in proportion

* 'The Study of Sociology.' By Herbert Spencer. London: Henry S. King & Co.; New York: D. Appleton & Co.

as they are habituated to antagonism, they will become better adapted to activities requiring union and agreement."

It is a dangerous thing to impute obvious self-contradiction to any statement of Gibbon's, a writer whose intellectual powers render him little prone to fall into confusion, whilst the compression of his style renders him eminently liable to be misinterpreted by an incautious reader. In this case it is surely not the author of the 'Decline and Fall' who has tripped. His statement is in substance that, under the circumstances of Roman society, peace and uniform government had prepared it for dissolution. The statement may or may not be true, but it does not involve an absurdity, since there is nothing inconsistent in saying that a nation accustomed to order among themselves may have lost the habit of resisting foreign aggression, or, on the other hand, in asserting that habits of antagonism to foreigners may produce a closer union and more energetic co-operation amongst a people trained to resist foreign hostility. Here, in fact, we come across what is, to use his own expression, the "bias" which leads so acute a reasoner as Mr. Spencer into the use of untenable arguments. The bias lies in the desire not only to prove an opponent to be in error, but also to make him out guilty of self-contradiction, and that by the use of some short and telling argument. Now, in the case under consideration, Gibbon may possibly entertain a mistaken view as to luxury, but the mistake (if mistake it be) could be exposed only by an examination of his whole position, and certainly does not involve an obvious confusion which can be shown up in a paragraph.

The errors we have already noted do not affect the substance of Mr. Spencer's views, but the desire for polemical triumphs occasionally leads him into taking up positions which not only involve an unconscious misrepresentation of the views under criticism, but also conduct to conclusions which are in themselves of very dubious soundness. In one of the most striking chapters of his book he maintains, with even more than his usual force of expression and aptness of illustration, that the modern world cherishes two opposite and inconsistent forms of religion, one of which he terms the religion of self-sacrifice, or altruism, and the other the religion of enmity. He further attempts to demonstrate that each of these religions rests on a partial truth; but that either of them taken alone involves at bottom an absolute contradiction of ideas. His general thesis is in our judgment a paradoxical form of stating an important truth as to the condition of modern opinion. The form, however, in which the statement is made is far better suited to captivate the attention of the crowd than to satisfy the requirements of thoughtful enquirers. But with the thesis itself we are not concerned. The point to which we wish to direct attention is the mode by which Mr. Spencer makes out that altruism involves a fundamental inconsistency of ideas.

Altruism or self-sacrifice, or, in other words, the preference for the good of others over one's own, involves a self-contradiction, as it is urged, on this ground: that, carried out without limitation, it injures B., for whom the sacrifice is made, even more than A., who makes the sacrifice. For "every one can remember cases where greediness for pleasures, reluctance to take trouble, and utter disregard of those around, have been perpetually increased by unmeasured and ever-ready kindnesses, while the unwise benefactor has shown by languid movements and pale face the debility consequent on disregard of self—the outcome of the policy being the destruction of the worthy in making worse the unworthy." The fact is true past a doubt, and is one of the most painful phenomena which experience of life presents. But it does not support the argument. The kindness which injures is not real kindness. If A. knows that he injures B. by a surrender of A.'s legitimate pleasure to B.'s illegitimate greediness, then it cannot really be self-sacrifice or love on A.'s part to make the sacrifice to B. But A. may not know the result of his actions; so be it. What follows is that neither self-sacrifice nor any other virtue can be practised without wisdom. Mr. Spencer fails in making out the self-contradiction which he wishes to establish, even on his own view of the religion of altruism. But his more fundamental error is that he first misrepresents (no doubt unconsciously) the view of life he means to attack, and then exhibits the supposed absurdities of the doctrine as he has misrepresented it. It is one thing to say that A. should act towards B. in the same way in which he would wish B. to act towards himself, and quite another to assert that A.'s duty is in every case to prefer B.'s gratification to his own. The first is a rational doctrine, and completely opposed to the religion of enmity. The other is a doctrine which we doubt any one's theoretically maintaining, and which indubitably may lead to useless sacrifice by A. and injury to B. Yet it is against the irrational and not the rational form of the dogma he is criticising that Mr. Spencer's objections are directed. In this, as in various other instances throughout his work, he sacrifices, as appears to us, the maintenance of an important truth to the attainment of an unimportant logical victory. The truth that self-regard may be quite as much a duty as a consideration for others, and is in fact the basis

on which right-dealing towards others must rest, cuts down a whole growth of falsely-called self-sacrifice and needs constant reiteration. Mr. Spencer sees this truth and up to a certain point maintains it, but ultimately sacrifices it to the pleasure of working out the absurdities which flow from an absurd view of so-called altruism. He obtains a logical success by fostering the popular prejudice which dissociates instead of identifying love and justice. Mr. Spencer's polemics are successful and brilliant, but he often rather confuses than routs his opponents.

COUNTRY LIVING.*

THESE two books come together to the reviewer's table. The one from the East is a thick volume, designed to cultivate a love of nature, and to recommend simplicity of life. It is much better adapted to the first of these purposes than to the second, its method being to point out, as it does carefully and well, though sometimes in too much the manner of a catalogue, the leading points of beauty and interest in the natural objects of the old, neglected roads and paths and farmsteads of the less cultivated parts of Eastern Massachusetts, and to set in contemptuous contrast with these that which it is the chief purpose of the more modest little volume which meets it from the West to commend.

Mr. Flagg supposes that landscape gardeners and architects, in distinction from ordinary cultivators and builders, have it for their business to superadd artificial decoration to the beauties of nature. He regards them not only as the declared enemies of all natural simplicity, grace, and picturesqueness, but as the accepted ministers of the purse-proud, ostentatious, and vulgarly-conceited among men. His antipathy to them extends even to "popular writers on nature's aspects"—among whom he can never have thought of ranking himself—and those on landscape painting, who, "with all their professed admiration of nature, always place her in subordination to art." Mr. Cleveland, writing as a landscape architect, bases his work on the proposition that what is essentially important in his art lies back and absolutely independent "of mere decorations." The grouping of trees and shrubs, and the arrangement of fountains, flower-beds, rustic seats, and other such garden furniture, is but an incidental duty of his business, which is to adapt ground to the varied requirements of civilized society with artistic refinement of completeness. The gratification and cultivation of a love of nature he regards as but one among many such requirements.

The instructions of one author are directly contradicted by the other. Mr. Flagg says "the road that winds around the hill or the meadow is the one you must follow." "The old road is bordered with wild shrubbery, groups of trees of bold and irregular growth—there is no sameness." The new road, the landscape architect's road, is formal, unnatural, uninteresting, dreary. Mr. Cleveland says that in the old and common way of laying out roads "all the naturally beautiful or picturesque features have been destroyed or rendered hideous"; that the landscape architect asks, how can the road "be best adapted to the natural shape of the ground"? "How can any naturally attractive features, such as a river, a lake, or a mountain, near or distant, be made to minister to the beautiful or picturesque character of the place [neighborhood] by adapting the arrangement to the development of their most attractive aspects?"

Mr. Flagg loves the simplicity of the old, brown, slightly dilapidated house under the elms, its gambrelled roof studded with mosses, the green-sward of its door-yard close cropped by the cows; he loves to follow the paths by which the cows stray from it through the adjoining huckleberry lots; he loves to pick his way from tussock to tussock along the edge of the lily ponds, and to point out the thousand charms offered on every side to the enjoyment of a lover of nature. It is in such neighborhoods, such houses, and such simplicity, might Mr. Cleveland say, that I have found women living more confined, dull, and dreary lives than in any barbarous country; caring less for simple, natural pleasures than any other women in the world; that I have found the chief objects of their admiration and ambition the furthest removed from nature and nature's grace; it has been in such homes that insanity, consumption, typhoid fever, and diphtheria have found more victims than in those even of the densest and dirtiest of cities.

Mr. Cleveland thinks that a civilized home is distinguished from a barbarous one by the convenience and economy with which those who live in it can command the conditions of health, and the gratification of healthful desires and tastes, and that, while there are beauties to be found by the side of a cow-path and on the boggy shores of a pond, it is also possible to have them where they can be enjoyed with more convenience, under conditions more

* The Woods and By-Ways of New England. By Wilson Flagg, author of 'Studies in Field and Forest.' With [photographic] illustrations. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co.
* Landscape Architecture as applied to the Wants of the West, with an Essay on Forest Planting on the Great Plains. By H. W. S. Cleveland, Landscape Architect. Chicago: Jansen, McClurg & Co.

favorable to health and more economical of civilized raiment. He assumes that to associate natural and artificial attractions successfully in a home, much more where many homes are found in a limited neighborhood, as in villages and towns, and to secure with them other conditions of health and happy life, requires much and varied study, a deep sympathy with and reverence for nature, a designing fancy, and a shrewd power in adapting means to ends. This he would say is what is required in a landscape architect. Unquestionably he is right. Mr. Flagg has been misled by quacks. The home of ignorance, conceit, and vulgarity is what he finds it not through excess, but through lack, of art.

The latter half of Mr. Cleveland's book is an urgent plea for forest planting, especially on the Great Plain and its borders, with a review of what little has been done, and some practical advice as to what should be undertaken. The publication is valuable, timely, and altogether of good omen for the West.

The Birds of North America: Drawn from life, and uniformly reduced to one-quarter their natural size. By Theodore Jasper, A.M., M.D. Parts I.-V. (Columbus, Ohio: Jacob H. Studer.)—We can say nothing in favor of this publication. It stands in the same relation to science that the class of "Annals," "Floral Offerings," and "Ladies' Repositories" bears to literature. So far from the author's being, as is asserted for him, an "eminent naturalist," we doubt if he has the advantage of having been before known, even by name, to any ornithologist of repute. Furthermore, no ornithologist, of whatever ability, could to-day handle this subject without possessing certain material and data of which Dr. Jasper has not been able to avail himself. We refer, of course, to the collections of our principal museums and to the ornithological literature of the last thirty years. Not possessing the indispensable information, he seems inclined to ignore the need of it, and to fall back upon his own resources. This is a fatal lack of good sense, for his resources are those of a man scarcely on speaking terms with ornithology, whom an instinct of self-preservation might have prevented from displaying ignorance in an attempt to edify the public. What is good in the book was mostly written years ago by Audubon, Nuttall, and especially Wilson—who, by the way, is Dr. Jasper's chief refuge; and what is new is of no account whatever. The technicalities of the work are worse than useless, being misleading so far as they lead at all; the nomenclature is obsolete, and not even binomial; the classification is simply preposterous. The biographies make pleasant reading enough, we suppose, for those who believe all they see printed and are not particular about grammar. The plates are, for the most part, of an excellent order of cheap chromo-lithographs. They are uneven, however, some being bold caricatures, while others are fairly good—of their kind; and, finally, they are not uniformly reduced one-fourth, nor by any other scale.

The Electra of Sophocles. With Notes. By R. C. Jebb. Revised and edited, with additional Notes, by R. H. Mather, Professor of Greek and Ger-

man in Amherst College. (Boston: John Allyn, 1873.)—Unlike some other links of the *Catena Classicorum*, Jebb's 'Electra' is not well adapted to the use of the average students in American colleges. The notes consist very largely of citations of parallel passages which are not translated, and of discussions upon nice points of syntax and definition. These features are of value to the instructor or advanced student, but ordinary readers simply skip all such refinements. Prof. Mather has attempted to render the book suitable for use in his own classes, and, with that object in view, has omitted many of the quotations of parallel passages, and translated those which have been retained; has explained by translation or otherwise many difficulties, especially in the choral parts, where the most aid is needed; has added frequent references to the grammars of Hadley, Goodwin, Curtius, and Crosby; and has transferred the notes from the bottom of the page to the end of the book. With regard to the citations, it may reasonably be doubted if they are of any use to college students, even when translated; but they are certainly useless when not translated; hence the change is in the right direction. The editor's reason for disapproving of foot-notes—that such notes "are not so carefully studied as where the text-book is prepared in the other form"—is one at which many instructors will smile. They would banish foot-notes because they are too convenient to the student in recitation; but it is certainly very creditable to the editor's classes that his conclusion is based upon an experience so unlike that of many.

For a first edition, the book is quite free from typographical errors, especially in the Greek text. Slight errors may be found on pp. 107, 138, 139, 166, and 203. There are marks of hasty editing in some cases, as in the notes on vv. 81, 421, and 844, and on p. 211, line 1; and there are many cases, e.g., vv. 451, 698, 714, and 849, where Jebb's notes, retained by Mather, differ from other and perhaps better authorities, such as Wunder, Jeff's grammar, and Liddell and Scott's lexicon (sixth edition). Upon the whole, this edition is worthy to displace Woolsey's, which was, and still is, excellent, but has hardly been kept abreast of the times by revision and references to American grammars.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.

Publishers.—Prices.

Alexander (Mrs.), Which Shall It Be?	(Henry Holt & Co.)	\$1 25
Coulanges (F. de), The Ancient City	(Lee & Shepard)	
Dunglison (Dr. R.), Medical Dictionary	(Henry C. Lea)	
Edwards (Amelia B.), In the Days of My Youth	(Porter & Coates)	1 50
Fulton (C. C.), Europe Viewed through American Spectacles	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Jasper (Dr. T.), The Birds of North America, Part 5, swd.	(Robt. Clarke & Co.)	1 00
Johnson (Laura W.), Poems of Twenty Years	(De Witt C. Lent)	
Kiddle (H.), How to Teach	(J. W. Schermerhorn & Co.)	1 25
Lockyer (J. N.), Contributions to Solar Physics	(Macmillan & Co.)	10 00
Littell's Living Age, October, December, 1873	(Littell & Gay)	
Packard (A. S., Jr.), Insects of the Garden, Part 1, swd.	(Estes & Lauriat)	0 25
Prescott (W. H.), Conquest of Mexico, Vols. II. and III.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Thorpe (T. E.), Quantitative Analysis	(John Wiley & Son)	1 75
The Monitor Post-Office Guide	(E. W. Ballinger)	
Taylor (E. B.), The Stone Age, swd.	(Estes & Lauriat)	0 25
Smith (P. V.), History of the English Institutions	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Wetmore (Dr. W. J.), The Oriental: Eastern Melodies	(J. W. Schermerhorn & Co.)	1 25
White (Prof. J. W.), Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles	(Ginn Bros.)	1 50

HENRY HOLT & CO.,

25 BOND STREET, NEW-YORK,

Publish most of the Text-books in Modern Languages used at Yale, Harvard, and similar institutions, Freeman's Historical Course, Fiske's Class-room Taine, many other Text-books of equal merit, and standard miscellaneous works, including those of Mill, Taine, Tylor, Turgénieff, etc. Catalogues free.

J. Norman Lockyer's Book on the Sun.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOLAR
Physics. By J. Norman Lockyer, F.R.S. I.
Popular Account of Inquiries into the Physical Constitution of the Sun, with Special Reference to Recent Spectroscopic Researches. II. Communications to the Royal Society of London and the French Academy of Sciences, with Notes. Royal 8vo, cloth, extra gilt, illustrated by seven Colored Plates and one hundred and seventy-five woodcuts, price \$10.

"The first part of the work, presenting the reader with a continuous sketch of the history of the various enquiries into the physical constitution of the sun, cannot fail to be of interest to all who care for the revelations of modern science; and the interest will be enhanced by the excellence of the numerous illustrations by which it is accompanied."—*Athenæum*.

MACMILLAN & CO., PUBLISHERS,
No. 38 Bleeker Street, New York.

DODD & MEAD invite attention to their large assortment of FAMILY and PULPIT BIBLES, of which they offer a large variety, in all styles of binding, and in price from \$3 75 to \$75.

DODD & MEAD, Publishers,
762 Broadway.

LORD CAMPBELL'S LIVES
OF THE
CHIEF JUSTICES OF ENGLAND.
NEW EDITION.
4 vols. 8vo, illustrated, cloth, bevelled, \$14.
half calf, extra, 25.

The brilliant success of this work is by no means greater than its merits. It is certainly the most brilliant contribution to English History made within our recollection.—*N. Y. Tribune*.

FAMOUS CASES OF CIRCUM-
stantial Evidence. With an Introduction on the Theory of Presumptive Proof. By S. N. Phillips. Cloth, \$2 25. Published by

ESTES & LAURIAT,
143 Washington Street, Boston.

Illustrated with 34 Etchings by Celebrated French and English Artists.

New Volume Just Completed.

THE PORTFOLIO. An Artistic Periodical. Edited by P. G. Hamerton, Esq. Illustrated with 34 Etchings by the following celebrated artists:

Jacquemart, Flameng, Carl Bodmer, Ridley, Legros, Lucas, Queyroy, Hamerton, Greux, Laguillermie, Feyen, Perrin, Chuttuk, Lalaune, Hedvin, and Massard; and Autotypes and Drawings on Stone after Reynolds, Romney, Fuseli, West, Barry, Morland, and Fragonard. 1 vol. royal 4to, cloth, gilt, \$14.

Imported by

J. W. BOUTON, 706 Broadway, New York,
and for sale by all Booksellers.

THE ANIMAL KINGDOM.—The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, of which Mr. Henry Reigh is President, is performing a work which must meet the approval of all right-thinking people. THE ANIMAL KINGDOM is a journal published under the auspices of this Society, and is devoted exclusively to the welfare of our humble fellow-creatures—the dumb animals. It is filled with interesting stories, sketches, etc., and has among its contributors Henry Ward Beecher, Wayne Hovey, Whittaker, Russell, Mrs. Wallace, and other charming writers. Those who feel an interest in the cause it advocates can receive the paper by enclosing one dollar, the yearly subscription, and addressing THE ANIMAL KINGDOM, 210 East Thirteenth Street, New York.

